Jenni Helakorpi

INNOCENCE, PRIVILEGE AND RESPONSIBILITY

Power relations in policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education in three Nordic countries

Helsinki Studies in Education

83
2020

Kasvatustieteellisiä tutkimuksia, numero 83
Helsinki Studies in Education, number 83

Jenni Helakorpi

Innocence, privilege and responsibility

Power relations in policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education in three Nordic countries

Doctoral dissertation, to be presented for public discussion with the permission of the Faculty of Educational Sciences of the University of Helsinki, in lecture room 107, Athena building (Siltavuorenpenger 3A), on the 19th of August, 2020 at 4 pm.

Helsinki 2020

Pre-examiners
Assistant professor Angéla Kóczé, Central European University, Hungary
Professor (emerita) Audrey Osler, University of Leeds, UK and University of South-Eastern Norway, Norway

Custos
Professor Gunilla Holm, University of Helsinki

Supervisors
Associate professor, Sirpa Lappalainen, University of Eastern Finland
Professor, Fritjof Sahlström, Åbo Akademi, Finland
Research fellow (PhD), Reetta Mietola, University of Helsinki

Opponent
Professor Irene Molina, Uppsala University

Yliopistopaino Unigrafia, Helsinki

ISBN 978-951-51-6260-1 (paperback)
ISBN 978-951-51-6261-8 (PDF)

University of Helsinki, Faculty of Educational Sciences
Helsinki Studies in Education, number 83

Jenni Helakorpi

Innocence, privilege and responsibility:
Power relations in policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education in three Nordic countries

Abstract

This dissertation focuses on policies and practices promoting the basic education of Roma and Traveller national minorities in Finland, Sweden and Norway. The study analyses the power relations inherent in the current policies and practices. The interest lies especially in the subjectivities enabled and constrained by the relations of power in the promotion of basic education of Roma and Traveller national minorities. The study stems from the notion that the power relations and subjectivities are produced by travelling discourses which result from the interplay between national and international policy processes. The study consists of three publications and a summary. Each publication perceives the questions of power relations and subjectivities from their unique perspective.

The study is positioned in the intersections between several disciplines, such as education, sociology, feminist studies, studies on ethnic relations and minority research. Theoretically, the study draws from feminist theories, poststructuralism and critical theories on race and whiteness. The transnational and translocal data of the study includes a) policy documents about Roma, Travellers and basic education (N=8) from Finland, Sweden and Norway, and b) interviews with 24 research participants who are implementing the policy measures. The interviews with five of the research participants from the Finnish data are ethnographic, including participant observations for one to four days.

The study identifies three problem representations from the policy documents: 1. “Special needs of Roma pupils”; 2. “Roma families” and 3. “National minority cultures at school” making the Roma and Travellers the focus of attention rather than the school institutions, structural discrimination or racism. One of the practices the policy documents promote is “Roma mediators”, whose work is validated by these problem representations. The analysis shows that the work of the Roma mediators is constrained by the current power relations since, in order to do their work, Roma mediators need to negotiate with the discourse of tolerance which submits individuals to relations of power where some are the potential tolerating actors and others may become tolerated. Roma mediators are perceived as representatives of all the Roma, assumed to work against biases with their own presence. The responsibility for change is placed on the shoulders of the Roma mediators. Another policy measure that is closely scrutinised in this research is

the measure of providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers in schools. This research shows that the actors who identify as Roma or Travellers use knowledge about the groups to react to racialization of Roma and Travellers in schools and to challenge the silence about the Roma and Travellers in the nation states. The analysis highlights that the notion of providing knowledge involves the premise that the responsibility for change and transformation is on the Roma.

It is argued that the current policies and practices focus on Roma and Travellers and their actions in manifold and persistent ways, enabling the subjectivity of innocence for other than Roma and Travellers. The analysis suggests that the subjectivities enabled for Roma and Travellers include being those responsible for change, for the current situation, and for being inadequate, whereas the subjectivities of innocence, not being responsible, being a helper, and a tolerating actor are enabled for others. Making the Roma and Travellers the focus of attention and enabling innocence and helper subjectivities for others reflects the asymmetrical power relations the current discourses subject individuals into. The study argues that Roma policies would benefit from a further analysis of the current power relations produced by the discourses in order to promote the equality of the Roma and Travellers in these societies.

Keywords: Roma, Travellers, minority rights and politics, Nordic countries, basic education, power relations, racialisation, whiteness

Helsingin yliopisto, Kasvatustieteellinen tiedekunta
Kasvatustieteellisiä tutkimuksia, numero 83

Jenni Helakorpi

Viattomuus, etuoikeus ja vastuu:
Valtasuhteet kansallisten romanivähemmistöjen peruskoulutusta koskevissa toimintapolitiikoissa ja käytännöissä

Tiivistelmä

Tarkastelen tässä väitöskirjassa niitä toimintapolitiikkoja ja käytäntöjä, joita kohdistetaan kansallisten romanivähemmistöjen peruskoulutuksen edistämiseen Suomessa, Ruotsissa ja Norjassa. Tutkimuksessa analysoin toimintapolitiikoissa ja käytännöissä rakentuvia valtasuhteita. Tutkimuksessani kysyn, minkälaisia subjektiviteetteja - käsityksiä itsestä suhteessa muihin ja yhteiskuntaan - toimintapolitiikoissa ja käytännöissä rakentuvissa valtasuhteissa yksilöille mahdollistuu. Tutkimukseni lähtökohtana on, että tarkastelemani valtasuhteet ja subjektiviteetit rakentuvat vaeltavissa diskursseissa. Vaeltavat diskurssit rakentuvat kansallisten ja kansainvälisten politiikkaprosessien välisessä vuorovaikutuksessa. Tutkimus koostuu kolmesta julkaisusta ja yhteenveto-osasta.

Tutkimus on monitieteinen liikkuen kasvatustieteen, sosiologian, feministisen tutkimuksen ja vähemmistötutkimuksen risteymissä. Tutkimuksen teoreettinen perusta ammentaa feministisistä teorioista, jälkistrukturalismista ja kriittisistä rodun ja valkoisuuden teorioista. Tutkimuksen ylirajainen, transnationaalinen ja translokaalinen, aineisto koostuu suomalaisista, ruotsalaisista ja norjalaisista romaneja ja peruskoulutusta koskevista politiikkadokumenteista (N=8) sekä haastatteluista 24 tutkimusosallistujan kanssa, jotka työssään toimeenpanevat kansallisia politiikkaohjelmia. Viiden suomalaisen osallistujan haastattelut ovat etnografisia sisältäen osallistuvaa havainnointia yhdestä neljään päivän ajalta.

Tutkimuksessa politiikkadokumenteista identifioidaan kolme keskeistä tapaa esittää ongelmia kansallisten romanivähemmistöjen peruskoulutukseen liittyen: 1. ”romanioppilaiden erityiset tarpeet” 2. ”romaniperheet” ja 3. ”kansallisten vähemmistöjen kulttuurit koulussa”. Politiikkadokumenteissa ongelmat paikannetaan siis monin tavoin romaneihin sen sijaan, että ongelmaksi kuvattaisiin kouluinstituution rakenteet, rakenteellinen syrjintä tai rasismi. Yksi politiikkadokumenttien ehdottama toimenpide on romanitaustaisten työntekijöiden palkkaaminen kouluun työskentelemään romanioppilaiden ja -perheiden sekä koulun henkilökunnan kanssa (Roma mediators). Romanitaustaisten työntekijöiden tarvetta perustellaan yllämainituilla ongelmarepresentaatioilla. Tutkimuksen analyysi suomalaisten romanitaustaisten työntekijöiden työstä kuitenkin osoittaa, että voidakseen tehdä työtään, romanitaustaisten työntekijöiden tulee neuvotella suvaitsevaisuuden diskurssin

kanssa ja asettua sen tuottamiin valtasuhteisiin. Suvaitsevaisuuden diskurssissa yksilöt asemoituvat valtasuhteisiin, joissa osa paikantuu mahdollisiksi suvaitsijoiksi ja toiset mahdollisiksi suvaituiksi. Romanitaustaiset työntekijät nähdään kaikkien romanien edustajina, joiden oletetaan työskentelevän ennakkoluuloja vastaan omalla läsnäolollaan ja näin tulevan myös mahdollisesti suvaituiksi. Vastuu muutoksesta asettuu näin romanitaustaisten työntekijöiden harteille. Tutkimuksessa analysoidaan myös tiedon tarjoamista romaneista kouluissa. Tiedon tarjoaminen romaneista on laajasti ehdotettu käytäntö politiikkadokumenteissa. Tutkimuksessa osoitetaan, että haastatellut pohjoismaiset romanitoimijat pyrkivät tiedon avulla haastamaan romaneja rodullistavia prosesseja koulussa sekä koulujen ja yhteiskunnan laajaa vaikenemista romaneista osana näitä kansallisvaltioita. Analyysi osoittaa, että käytäntönä myös tiedon tarjoaminen romaneista sisältää lähtökohdan, jossa vastuu muutoksesta on romaneilla.

Tutkimukseni keskeinen johtopäätös on, että nykyiset toimintapolitiikat ja käytännöt koskien romaneja ja peruskoulua keskittyvät ennen kaikkea romaneihin ja heidän toimintaansa, mikä mahdollistaa viattoman subjektiviteetin muille kuin romaneille. Tutkimuksen analyysi ehdottaa, että romaneille mahdollistuvat subjektiviteetit ovat sellaisia, joihin sisältyy vastuu muutoksesta, nykyisestä tilanteesta sekä käsitys itsestä vaillinaisena. Samanaikaisesti muille kuin romaneille on tarjolla viattoman, auttajan ja suvaitsijan subjektiviteetit. Katson, että keskittyminen romaneihin ja samanaikainen viattoman ja auttajan subjektiviteettien tarjoaminen muille heijastelee niitä epäsymmetrisiä valtasuhteita, joihin nykyiset diskurssit yksilöt asettavat. Väitänkin, että toimintapolitiikat, joissa pyritään romanien koulutuksen edistämiseen, hyötyisivät sen analysoimisesta, minkälaisia valtasuhteita nykyiset diskurssit tuottavat. Näin romaneja koskevissa kansainvälisissä ja kansallisissa politiikkaprosesseissa pystyttäisiin entistä paremmin edistämään romanien yhdenvertaisuutta.

Avainsanat: romanit, vähemmistöoikeudet ja -politiikka, Pohjoismaat, peruskoulu, valtasuhteet, rodullistaminen, valkoisuus

Acknowledgements

This research and my way of thinking and writing would look very different without the people I have had the privilege to work with. I have had many people believing in me and supporting me, which has been imperative for conducting this research and for this research to have the shape it has. I am little saddened that due to the covid-19 pandemic I am not able to organize a party where I could give speeches and thank all of you in person. These acknowledgements are not able to reach the gratitude I feel about all of you.

First and foremost I want to thank the participants of my study. The brilliant professionals and activists who took the time to introduce their work and discuss with me. I could never thank you enough.

I have had the privilege to have a great team of supervisors: thank you to Sirpa Lappalainen, for guiding me and thinking with me. In my experience, you have a sensitive, listening and respecting way of supervising. You have carefully helped and supported me to find my voice as a researcher and my way of conducting research. Fritjof Sahlström, thank you for your open-minded thinking about research and making me believe that challenges in the research process are always solvable. Reetta Mietola, I could not imagine what kind of a researcher I would be without you. No words are enough to thank you for your supervision, your friendship and the way you have believed in me, supported, taught and mentored me. I also want to express my gratitude to my pre-examiners Audrey Osler and Angéla Kóczé for elaborate reading of my thesis and valuable and supportive comments.

Thank you to the *Nordic Center of Excellence Justice through Education* (JustEd) for financing my research. Thank you to Gunilla Holm, the director of JustEd, for all the support during this process. I have learned so much from you. I am happy and grateful that you are also sharing the defense preparations and the defense day with me in the role of custos.

Thank you to Elina Lahelma and Pirkko Hynninen. It has been such a privilege to work with you, to learn from you and to be part of *Cultural and feminist education research group* (KUFE). You introduced me to cultural and feminist research and as a scholar I want to follow in your footsteps.

I want to thank Reetta Mietola and Anna-Maija Niemi for taking me in to the *Special Needs Class in the Course of Life* -project that changed my path as a researcher in countless ways. Like Reetta, Anna-Maija Niemi, you are such an important colleague who always gets me excited about this work. Furthermore, you have become such a close friend to me. I cannot wait where the future takes our collaboration!

I have received invaluable comments for the research from colleagues in seminars, conferences and summer schools. I especially want to thank Sirpa's doctoral seminar: Aarno Kauppila, Saija Volmari, Touko Vaahtera, Penni Pietilä and Helena Hinke Dobrochinski Candido as well as Gunilla's doctoral seminar, Solveig Cornér, Tuuli From, Denice Haldin, Ida Hummelstedt, Ina Juva, Monika Londén, Eva Louro, Katarina Perander, Iida Pyy and Anna Slotte.

Thank you to Satu Blomerus, Susanna Rajala and Marita Korp from Roma education group of the Finnish National Agency of Education. Thank you so much for supporting and helping me, commenting my research and sharing your knowledge and expertise with me.

I want to thank Suvi Keskinen, Unnur Dís Skaptadóttir and Mari Toivanen, the editors of the book *Undoing Homogeneity: Migration, Difference and the Politics of Solidarity,* for including the third publication of my thesis to the edited book. Thank you for the elaborate and interesting process.

Thank you to Ida Hummelstedt, you have become such an import colleague and a close friend. Thank you for your enthusiasm and always making me believe that my way of conducting research has its place. Tuuli From and Ina Juva, we started together and we have shared this ride together. Thank you for being there and that I can always count on you. I could not imagine this process without you. Thank you to Saija Volmari, Tuuli Kurki, Aarno Kauppila and Pia Mikander for always inspiring and thought provoking discussions about research (and life!). Thank you to Anna-Leena Riitaoja, Ulpukka Isopahkala-Bouret and Marko Stenroos for great and inspiring collaboration outside my PhD-thesis. Thank you for all the discussions and for sharing your insights and knowledge. Anne-Mari Souto, I want to thank you for the enthusiasm you have shown for my research and this way encouraging me in the academia more than you know.

Thank you to other great colleagues with whom we have shared conferences, seminars, lunches, parties, ideas and projects and who have commented my work: Aminkeng Atabong Alemanji, Janina Da Silva Gonçalves, Hanna Guttorm, Katariina Hakala, Riikka Hohti, Heidi Huilla, Elina Ikävalko, Mikael Kivelä, Magdalena Kmak, Pekka Koskinen, Jukka Lehtonen, Tuire Liimatainen, Ameera Masoud, Katariina Mertanen, Sari Mononen-Batista Costa, Hanna Niinistö, Camilla Nordberg, Antti Paakkari, Hannele Pitkänen, Sonja Raunio, Minna Seikkula, Mia Smeds, Mari Simola, Anna Suni, Liisa Tainio, Venla Toivonen, Reetta Toivanen, Verneri Valasmo and Tuija Veintie.

I have conducted this research in three countries, which was made possible by my colleagues. I want to thank all my colleagues in the University of Gothenburg, especially Dennis Beach for hosting me, Ylva Odenbring for collaboration and mentoring me and Zahra Bayati, Marianne Dovemark, Petra Angervall, Anna-Maria Fjellman and Johanna Mellén for making me feel so welcome, having important discussions with me and for commenting my work. I also want to thank Valgerður S. Bjarnadóttir for sharing the Gothenburg experience with me and for

encouraging me. From Umeå University, I want to thank everyone for welcoming me so warmly. I especially want to express my gratitude to Nafsika Alexiadou for taking the time to have such thorough discussions with me, for sharing your expertise with me and for your wholehearted support and hospitality. I also want to thank Lisbeth Lundahl for your hospitality and support. From Oslo Metropolitan University, I want to thank Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij for hosting me and expressing your sincere interest in my research. Without your support in Norway, this research would look very different. From Norway, I also want to thank my dear colleagues Vidar Fagerheim Kalsås and Kari Hagatun. Vidar, I have been so happy to share thoughts with you, plan research together and writing together. Thank you also for helping me to understand the Norwegian context and for commenting my texts. Kari, I want to thank you for all our time together in Oslo, our discussions and your help. From Södertörn University, I want to express my gratitude to Christina Rodell Olgaç and Angelina Dimiter-Taikon for introducing me to the Swedish context. I also want to thank Nina Carlsson for all our discussions, shared conferences and friendship. Thank you to Norma Montesino for sending me a copy of your PhD-thesis together with encouraging words.

My sincerest thank you to all my friends outside the academia for all the joy and warmth you bring into my life. For all the support, I especially want to thank Johanna, Liisa, Paula, Tuomas, Nina, Iiru, Olli, Lotta, Piia, Marika, Susanna, Risto, Miska and Karoliina. Special thank you to my amazing godchildren Onni, Frans and Selja. Thank you to my family, especially my father Hannu, godfather Pertti, Anna, Janne, Jaakko, Pertti, Marja-Leena, Niina, Ole, Pipsa and Jukka. Thank you to my mother Satu for everything you have done for me. Thank you for always believing in me and for always being there when I need you – which is often. Pyry, my partner in life, my home, thank you for everything and for making me so unbelievably happy in life. And Pihla, our little daughter, you are sleeping in my arms as I am writing these acknowledgements on a way too hot summer day. You are the sunshine of my life, our miracle, thank you for being you.

In Helsinki, 26.6.2020
Jenni Helakorpi

Table of Contents

TABLES

List of Original Publications

I Helakorpi, J., Lappalainen, S. & Mietola, R. (2020) Equality in the making? Roma and Traveller minority policies and basic education in three Nordic countries. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research,* 64(1), pp. 52–69,
DOI: 10.1080/00313831.2018.1485735

II Helakorpi, J., Lappalainen, S. & Sahlström, F. (2019) Becoming tolerable: Subject constitution of Roma mediators in Finnish schools. *Intercultural education*, 30(1), pp. 51–67, DOI: 10.1080/14675986.2018.1537671.

III Helakorpi, J. (2019) Knowledge about Roma and Travellers in Nordic schools: paradoxes, constraints and possibilities. In S. Keskinen, U.D. Skaptadóttir & M. Toivanen, ed., *Undoing Homogeneity: Migration, Difference and the Politics of Solidarity*. Studies in Migration and Diaspora, Routledge, London, pp. 69–87.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CoE	Council of Europe
CoE Treaty 157	The Council of Europe Treaty 157, The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities
EU	European Union
FNAE	Finnish National Agency of Education
IGO	Intergovernmental Organization
IRU	International Romani Union
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NRIS	National Roma Integrations Strategy
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe
ROMPO	Finland's National Roma Policy
SNAE	Swedish National Agency for Education
UN	United Nations
WPR-approach	What's the Problem Represented to Be approach by Carol Bacchi

1 Introduction

At the inception of my PhD studies I gave a presentation in which I described my observations from Finland. These observations included how culture is utilised as an explanation for issues considering the Roma and education, how these explanations may racialize Roma and how the focus on culture conceals structural questions such as power relations or racism. I was eagerly waiting to hear reflections from scholars who I looked up to. I was taken off guard when a loud voice from the back of the room declared: "yes, yes, we all know about racialization of the Roma but what should we do? What should we do with the Roma in schools?" I hesitantly mumbled something slightly resembling an answer. Little did I know that this would be the question I would be confronted with after most of my presentations during my PhD journey and that I would mostly be reluctantly murmuring some answers.

So why do I regard the question of "what to do" as problematic? According to the national surveys in Finland, Sweden and Norway, Roma and Traveller pupils are at a greater risk than their peers of dropping out of basic education (i.e., comprehensive school) and of not continuing to upper secondary education (AID 2009; MSAH 2009; NOU 2015; SOU 2010:55). Promotion of education is central in current policy processes. A typical point of departure is that promoting the education of Roma and Travellers is a means to achieve equality and justice. In Roma and Traveller policies, education is emphasized as a transformative force – as it often is when considering marginalized groups who face discrimination (see, e.g., Kauppila, Mietola & Niemi 2018). This emphasis in Roma and Traveller policies is understandable since being without formal education renders one vulnerable in the employment market in the current European/Nordic societies. This means vulnerability in achieving good-quality living conditions: without paid employment it is difficult to manage financially. Thus, formal education is seen as a promise of justice – it should lead to a better income and also eventually to positions of power. As a researcher in education I am assumed to be able to determine how the education of Roma and Travellers could be promoted.

For finding answers there would be a large body of literature and an even greater body of general explanations repeatedly recounted in the public discussion about Roma, Travellers and education. [1] However, the reason why I hesitate to consider the question of "what to do" as a guiding question is that it involves multiple assumptions which I do not want to commit to but which I want instead

[1] Although "Roma" is typically used as an umbrella term to refer to both Roma and Travellers, I use this word pair "Roma and Travellers" because in the Nordic context the English term Roma does not include Norwegian Travellers. I will take a closer look at these terms in chapter 2.

to perceive critically. One of the reasons why I want to hesitate about the question of "what to do" is the long history of discrimination against these groups in the Nordic societies. Finland, Sweden and Norway (like other European countries) have committed atrocities against these groups (see Pulma 2006). The circumstances have altered in the last few decades (Pulma 2006; Friman-Korpela 2014), but in Finland, Sweden and Norway still, as in other European countries, Roma and Travellers face discrimination and racism (see Castaneda, Erhola, Kuusio, Weiste-Paakkanen & Lämsä 2018; FRA 2016; Keskinen, Alemanji, Himanen, Kivijärvi, Osazee, Pöyhölä & Rousku 2018; Non-discrimination ombudsman 2014; NOU 2015; Rosvoll & Bielenberg 2012; SOU 2016). A number of Roma have recounted incidents of everyday racism such as discrimination in work life, education, shops, petrol stations, hospitals and amusement parks in the Finnish media lately (e.g., YLE Uutiset 2018a&b). In Sweden, an incident shaking the nation was the revelation that the police had collected a register on Swedish Roma (see Kommissionen mot antiziganism 2015a). In Norway prejudices against Norwegian Roma and Travellers are likewise prevalent (Rosvoll & Bielenberg 2012; NOU 2015; Muižnieks 2015). In schools, Roma and Traveller pupils have been found to be subjected to prejudice, racism and bullying (Junkala & Tawah 2009; NOU 2015; Rajala et al. 2011; Rajala & Blomerus 2015; SOU 2010). It is noteworthy that in Finland, Sweden and Norway education has historically been applied for assimilation purposes, being perceived as imperative for "civilising" minoritised ethnic groups such as the Roma and Travellers. How should we understand the claims about the promotion of education of Roma and Traveller groups today? Change is wanted, but where? Can an assimilation mind-set be embedded in Roma and Traveller integration/inclusion?

In this study, I take a step back from the assumptions included in the demand to promote the basic education of Roma and Travellers. Rather than assuming that we are compelled to find ways to achieve this, I have asked what the promotion of basic education produces and how it is produced. The point I was trying to make in my first PhD presentation was how the education promotion practices in Finnish schools may contribute to discrimination against the Roma or hinder change. As in that presentation, the starting-point of this research has been to try to understand what is done right now by way of promoting basic education of Roma and Travellers and what this "what is done" does. The policy-makers, teachers, activists and researchers discussing these topics, writing and implementing policies, create descriptions and understandings about Roma and Travellers, education systems and their inter-relations. Thus, devising solutions and promoting education produces perceptions about Roma, Travellers, and basic education – emphasizing some understandings over others.

In this study, I have investigated Finnish, Swedish, and Norwegian policies and practices concerning the promotion of basic education of national minority

Roma and Travellers. The aim of the study has been theoretically and historically to understand and conceptualise travelling discourses and power relations surrounding the policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education. My research is intended to make sense of the process of how the current policies and practices have emerged historically and in these specific contexts. I have tried to understand how the relations between Roma, Travellers and basic education have come to be understood as they are now and what these understandings result in. The emphasis of the study is on the subjectivities and power relations the current policies and practices enable and constrain.

The study data consists of policy documents about Roma, Travellers, and basic education from Finland, Sweden and Norway and interviews with individuals who are implementing the policy measures. From the Finnish interview data, the interviews with five of the research participants are ethnographic, including participant observations. Drawing from feminist poststructural theories, especially in education, the study asks what is constituted as problems by the policy measures (Bacchi 2000; 2009; 2010) and how do the interviewees make sense of their work (Davies 2004; Lather 1997; St. Pierre & Pillow 2000; St. Pierre 2000). The aim is to show how the current power relations work and how the agency of the professionals who identify as Roma or Travellers appears within the current relations of power. Rather than comparing, I analyse the policies and practices transnationally and translocally, identifying tendencies produced by travelling discourses. Since Finland, Sweden and Norway have shared histories, have co-operated historically, and are currently co-operating on Roma and Traveller policies, their policies and practices are and have been intertwined (Pulma 2006; AID 2009; MSAH 2016; SOU 2009).

The study consists of three publications and this summary. In the publications, I have analysed the steering Roma, Traveller and basic education policies (publication I) and two widespread practices that are promoted in these policies: "Roma mediators" (publication II) and "provision of knowledge about Roma or Traveller national minorities" (publication III). The policies are analysed by asking what are constituted as problems by the policy measures in basic education (publication I). The practice of Roma mediators is perceived by analysing the power relations in the work of Roma mediators in Finnish schools, using ethnographic data (publication II). The policy notion of "knowledge about Roma and Travellers" is perceived by analysing the ways workers who identify as Roma or Travellers make sense of this policy measure (publication III).

This summary is organized as follows: I will start with an introduction to the contexts where these policies promoting basic education of Roma and Travellers emerge in Finland, Sweden and Norway. This is followed by my research questions and theoretical choices. I will then move on to describe the methodology of the study, the data I generated, the analytic process and ethical questions. In the fifth chapter, I will present the three sub-studies, after which I draw my

conclusions. I will end this summary with a discussion of challenging the current power relations in knowledge production, policy-making and practices in promotion of basic education of Roma and Travellers and for other minoritised groups.

2 Policies and practices concerning Roma, Travellers and basic education

In this chapter, I provide a socio-historical context for the study. I will discuss the current national minority categories and their emergence in both the international and national contexts. I will likewise describe the national basic education policy contexts. When using the terms Roma and Travellers in this study, I refer to the groupings by current policy categories applying to national minority Roma and Travellers in Finland, Sweden and Norway. I will start this context chapter with a brief discussion about current terminology, and will then continue by introducing how the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian policy categories have emerged and what trajectories they have. To put the focus on the policy categories and their histories is not to undermine the lived identities of Roma and Travellers (see Hall 1999; Mirga 2018), but to scrutinize the current policies in their contexts.

2.1 Terminology

Before moving on to the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian contexts, I discuss the terms "Roma" and "Travellers", which are central to this study. "Roma" or "Roma and Travellers" are umbrella terms including many Roma and Traveller groups. The European Union recognises the Roma (and Travellers) as the largest and one of the oldest ethnic groups in Europe (FRA 2019). However, there is diversity in how people identifying as Roma or Traveller approach the transnational "Roma-ness and Traveller-ness", including collective claims making and group identities (Bunescu 2014; Herakova 2009; Vermeersch 2006; Rövid 2011). One example of differing positions in relation to transnational Roma politics is how Finnish Roma activists have historically distanced themselves from the international Roma movements and especially from Romani nationalism (Friman-Korpela 2014, 137–138). Thus, the ways groups are named and their histories, cultures and present days described are in many respects political topics and sites of negotiation and struggle. The current groupings do not reflect some simple and pre-existing groups or identities (see, e.g., Bunescu 2014). There are multiple lines of argumentation regarding transnational Roma-ness: some emphasise the "naturalness" of pre-existing historical roots of all Roma (see, e.g., Hancock 1991) whereas others stress the political necessity of constructing the transnational category (see, e.g., Bunescu 2014). There are numerous "middle-way" positions in the debate (e.g., Mirga 2018).

The emergence of the term "Roma" as referring to transnational Roma identity is entangled in the process of "Romani political mobilization" (Vermeersch 2006, 13). Ilana Bunescu (2014) relates that, as a political issue, the one shared Roma

identity arose in the first International Romani Congress in 1971, where a national anthem, a flag and ethno-nationalism of the Roma gained also ground as topics of Roma politics (see also Kocze & Rövid 2012). This resulted in the founding of the International Romani Union (IRU) and Roma as a nation, a Roma nation, evolved into a political concept (see also Matras 2013). Today, in official and scholarly contexts used by non-Roma, the term "Roma" (or "Roma and Travellers") is perceived as the preferred general umbrella term rather than the old terms that were often derogatory (Matache 2017a). The use of the umbrella term is not, however, harmonized and is under discussion (see, e.g., Matras 2013)[2]. In translating the Nordic context into English, it is important to use the word pair "Roma and Travellers" to include all the national minorities who fall under the umbrella term "Roma". This point will be clarified further in the next section in discussing the national minority policy categories.

At the turn of the millennium, the Nordic countries except for Iceland ratified the Council of Europe Treaty 157, *the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (CoE Treaty 157) and *the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (CoE ETS No. 148). Finland, Sweden and Norway defined certain Roma and Traveller groups as national/traditional minorities, whereas Denmark excluded the Roma from national minority-ness. **Finland** named one Roma group, the Finnish Roma/Kale as one of its national minorities.[3] No statistics have been gathered in these countries on ethnic grounds, but the current estimate in Finland today is that there are approximately 9,000–10,000 Finnish Roma in Finland (Rajala & Blomerus 2015).[4] The mother tongue of most Finnish Roma is Finnish or Swedish (Hedman 2015). The Finnish Romani language (the kaalo dialect/ *fennoromani*) is endangered, needing revitalisation measures: in 2009 Henry Hedman estimated that one third of Finnish Roma master Romani language. In **Sweden,** the national minority Roma (*romer*) includes various Roma groups, including Swedish Travellers, the estimated number of all the Roma who

[2] The use of the umbrella terms is not harmonized (Matras 2013). The Council of Europe (2012) has produced a *Descriptive Glossary of terms relating to Roma issues* which declares that "The term 'Roma' used at the Council of Europe refers to Roma, Sinti, Kale and related groups in Europe, including Travellers and the Eastern groups (Dom and Lom), and covers the wide diversity of the groups concerned, including persons who identify themselves as Gypsies" (CoE 2012, 4). However, in the Norwegian context the English term "Roma" does not include Norwegian Travellers (*Romanifolk/tatere*).

[3] The Finnish national minority policies are not as straightforward as in Sweden and Norway in that the Finnish use of the concept of national minority is to some extent vague. Roma and other national minorities are often referred to as "old or traditional" minorities. Whereas Sweden and Norway have white papers defining clearly which groups are national minorities, Finland has not produced such a document. The groups Finland report to the Council of Europe under the Treaty 157 are: Samí, Russian speakers, Estonian speakers, Roma, Tatars, Jewish, Karelian speakers (Finnish and Russian) and Swedish speakers (MFAF 2019). For the clarity's sake, from now on I will use the term national minority in the Finnish context as well.

[4] The estimates include individuals who identify as Roma or Traveller themselves.

are included in the national minority category being around 50,000 (SOU 2010). The mother tongue of individuals included in the Swedish national minority Roma varies from different Romani dialects to Swedish, Finnish and other languages (Bijvoet & Fraurud, 2007). In **Norway**, there are two national minorities who fall under the international umbrella term Roma: Roma (*rom*) and Travellers (*romanifolk*/*tatere*). The estimate is that there are around 700 Norwegian Roma and around 4,000–10,000 Norwegian Travellers in Norway (Engebrigtsen 2015; Muižnieks 2015). The mother tongue of the Norwegian Roma is Romani (Norwegians translate the language into English as "Romanes") (AID 2009). Although the majority of individuals identifying as Travellers speak Norwegian as their mother tongue, the language of Norwegian Travellers (*Scandoromani*/ Norwegian romani) constitutes an important part of Traveller identity for many (NOU 2015).

The historical trajectories of the current Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian national minority categories are diverse, tangled and even contested. The early history of the emergence of the policy categories in these three countries as well as Denmark is interconnected, as is the whole history of Finland, Sweden, Norway and Denmark. Miika Tervonen (2012a, 35) asserts that Roma and Travellers have historically been marginalised by the Nordic states. The marginalization has been connected to the history of "control over mobility, labour and poor-relief, as well as a shift from feudalism to mercantile capitalism" (Tervonen 2012a, 35). In various periods of time, the presence of Roma and Travellers (as well as other mobile groups) were outlawed or legitimised as a result of complicated societal interests such as controlling mobility, the right kind of labour, nation-state building and defining who deserves poor-relief (see also Montesino-Parra 2002). Thus, the policies directed to the Roma and Travellers reflect the disparate socio-political historical circumstances of the Nordic countries and Europe throughout history. It is important to emphasise that although the trajectories of the policy categories are based on repressive policies, in reality Roma and Travellers have had a significant part in the history and functioning of these societies, having for instance conducted a considerable part of the essential work in agrarian societies and in the military (Pulma 2006; Tervonen 2012a). Thus, although the historical trajectories I am about to describe are in many respects marginalising and even destructive, the actual participation in the functions of the countries, particularly the local economy, by people identified as Roma and Travellers has been notable (and understudied) (see, e.g., Tervonen 2012a).

2.2 The historical trajectories of the current Nordic policy categories

The first literary notes mentioning Roma and Travellers in the Nordic countries are from the early 16th century. At that time, Finland was a region of Sweden under the Swedish crown and Norway was ruled by Denmark.[5] At that time, the terms "*tattare*"/"*tatere*"[6] were adopted from German to refer to groups of itinerant people in the Nordic region, who the officials probably believed shared the same origin (Pulma 2006; Montesino-Parra 2002; Rekola 2012). In Denmark in 1536 and 1555, deportation statutes of "tattare" were introduced in 1589, outlawry for "tattare" becoming a permanent policy in Denmark-Norway (Pulma 2006, 19). The use of the categories was ambiguous and varied between regions (Rekola 2012). Especially in territories which are today parts of Norway and Sweden, the category was also utilised to refer to various local and foreign itinerant groups which the states wanted to control (Pulma 2006). In Norway, the term *tatere/omstreifere/fantefolket* came to refer to itinerant groups. According to Panu Pulma (2006, 111) Norway started to pay political attention to the itinerant groups in the 19th century, especially as part of the reorganisation of poor relief. In late 19th-century Norway, new legislation on criminality, vagrancy and labour colonies was implemented and the *tatere* group, Travellers, was targeted through all of these. "The Norwegian model" of policies on Travellers took its form, which included children's homes and labour colonies. Part of the Norwegian model was that a private missionary organisation, *Norsk misjon blant hjemløse*, carried out the policies (Pulma 2006). The aim was to "save the Traveller children" – to integrate and "normalize" Travellers into the society. This work continued until the 1980s and was also considered as a model for Finnish Roma policies especially after the Second World War (Pulma 2006). The current **Norwegian** national minority category **Travellers** (*romanifolk*/*tatere*) originates from here.

As in Denmark-Norway, in **Sweden,** which Finland was at that time part of, "*tattare*" were targeted by deportation policies in the 16th century. However, the Swedish deportation policies were local and no national deportation policy was introduced at that time. In Sweden, the term "*tattare"* became interchangeable with the term "*zigenare"* and the first law which explicitly targeted only *tattare/zigenare* in Sweden was formulated in 1637. At this time, the Swedish

[5] Until 1809, Finland and Sweden were one nation. At that time, the Kingdom of Denmark included Norway which continued until 1814. After this Sweden and Norway assembled a union until 1905, whereas after 1809 Finland was an autonomous Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire until 1917, when it became independent. The shared history has shaped the Nordic policies (Pulma 2006, 215-216).

[6] Most of the names of old policy categories are today considered disparaging (especially when used by someone not identifying as Roma or Traveller). The umbrella term "Roma" has been deployed to bring to an end the use of the offensive terms (see 2.1). To present the historical trajectories of the current policy categories, I, however, need to employ the historical terms.

government adopted repressive measures against many people living in poverty (Montesino Parra 2002, 41). This "hanging law" stated that *tattare/zigenare* had a year and a day to leave Sweden, after which *tattare/zigenare* men one might encounter within the Swedish region could be hanged without a trial and women and children should be deported (Pulma 2006, 24). It seems now, however, that this law was never implemented (Pulma 2006; Montesino-Parra 2002). At the end of the 17th century, Sweden began, partly forcibly, to recruit *tattare/zigenare* into the army, which changed the situation of some *tattare/zigenare*. While it was life-threatening to be recruited, it appears that military recruitment also contributed to upwards social mobility, certain *tattare/zigenare* becoming understood as domestic or native (Tervonen 2012a, 38; Pulma 2006, 197). During the next two centuries *tattare/zigenare* came to be perceived and referred to as a domestic group and, by the end of 18th century, the aim was to make the group settle (Pulma 2006, 30). In the late 19th-century (when Finland was already part of the Russian Empire) the ambiguous terms *tattare/zigenare* diverged in Sweden to refer to different groups. The distinction served to distinguish between the nation-state's now "domestic" "*tattare*" (Travellers) and the "foreign" "*zigenare*" (Roma) who migrated later (Montesino Parra 2002, 96).

During the 19th century after slavery was abolished in Hungary, Romania and the Balkans, a number of Roma, former slaves, migrated to different parts of Europe and North America.[7] In **Norway,** the Norwegian **Roma** (*rom*), refers to those Roma who migrated to Norway during this period, the 1800s. This intensified Roma migration impacted the Swedish category *tattare/zigenare*, which became divided into two different policy categories (*tatere*/Travellers and *zigenare*/Roma). These categories remained intact until the 1950s when new groups of Roma migrated to Sweden and were now categorised as "foreign": the category of "*zigenare*" became divided into the categories of "Swedish" and "foreign". This Roma category bifurcated even further when new Roma later migrated to Sweden (Montesino Parra 2002). Regardless of the apparent diversities of Roma and Traveller groups in Sweden, the Swedish national minority politics treat Swedish Roma and Travellers as one diverse group called "Roma" (*romer*), and they are targeted by the same policy processes (SOU 2010).

After hundreds of years as part of Sweden, **Finland** became an autonomous Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire in 1809. After this, the policy category Roma, *mustalainen/zigenare* became quite clear cut in the Finnish region, current research indicating that there were no other itinerant groups in Finland than the Finnish Roma, who now hold a national minority position (Pulma 2006, 48).

[7]When Roma migrated to Europe in the 1300s they were wanted for the work force. They became perceived as the property of their employers. This evolved into institutionalized slavery which was not abolished until the mid-19th century (Hancock 1991).

The history of the Roma and Traveller policy measures is complex (see Pulma 2006; Montesino Parra 2002).[8] The notions of assimilation and exclusion have dominated and alternated throughout history (Pulma 2006). In Norway, Travellers were subjected to forcible assimilation, whereas the Norwegian Roma were mostly excluded (Rosvoll, Lien & Brustad 2015). In the 20th century, the exclusion of Norwegian Roma was furthered when Norway introduced a clause in the Aliens Act of 1927 which banned Roma from entering the country (Engebrigtsen 2015). In the 1930s, the Norwegian Roma left Norway for continental Europe, one reason being to flee from the possibility of being subjected to the same assimilation practices then directed at Travellers in Norway (Rosvoll, Lien & Brustad 2015; Engebrigtsen 2015). When the Norwegian Roma tried to return Norway in 1934 to flee persecution, Norway forbade their return, which resulted in nearly all Norwegian Roma being caught and sent to Nazi extermination camps (Pulma 2006; Rosvoll & Bielenberg 2014; Rosvoll, Lien & Brustad 2015). The surviving Norwegian Roma were not allowed to re-enter Norway until the mid-1950s. Until the early 1970s, the authorities tried to restrain the Roma from coming and settling in Norway (Pulma 2006; Rosvoll, Lien & Brustad 2015).

In Sweden, assimilation and exclusion of Roma were carried out through both assimilation measures generally directed to groups understood as domestic or local and exclusion of those groups perceived as foreign or strangers. In the 19th century, the policies towards those perceived as domestic Roma and Travellers were discussed, resulting mostly in targeting them with same policies as those vagrants who were perceived as work-shy or morally corrupted (Montesino Parra 2002). Between the 1914 and 1954 foreign Roma were refused entry to Sweden (AMD 2014; Rodell Olgaç 2007). In the 1950s, new social policies on the Roma were designed in which Roma were framed as socially disabled (Montesino & Ohlosson Al Fakir 2015).

The Finnish Roma policies after the Second World War resembled the Norwegian Traveller policies, from which Finnish policy took its cue (Pulma 2006). This meant practices such as "normalising" the Roma by taking children from their families and placing them in children's homes (Friman-Korpela 2013; Pulma 2006).

In the turn of the 20th century, academics promoted the use of eugenics to inform the state politics and for shaping the legal frameworks in the Nordic region (see e.g. Broberg & Roll-Hansen 2005; Roll-Hansen 2003; Mattila 1999; Hietala 2009; Björkman & Widmalm 2010). Eugenic discourses and policies have had an effect on Roma and Travellers in the Nordic states. Eugenics was a global

[8] This description of history does not grasp the complexities and diversities of measures and policies over time towards different groups in various countries. For more detailed and comprehensive descriptions see, e.g., Pulma (2006), Montesino Parra (2002), Rosvoll, Lien & Brustad (2015), Friman-Korpela (2013), Mattila (2005) and Sjögren (2010).

movement and ideology developed in modernity. It focused on biopolitical control of future generations and stemmed from the idea that physical, psychological, moral and social characteristics were hereditary (see e.g. Mitchell & Snyder 2003). Those driving the eugenic agenda justified eugenic policies by fear of degeneration and the objective of cultivating the nations. They perceived societies as having the right and the obligation to protect themselves from degeneration with eugenic policies (Mattila 2003; Hietala 2009).

The policies connected to eugenics, especially sterilizations, were also argued to be essential for construction of the welfare state, in particular for defining those eligible to welfare services. The aim of the policies was to have less citizens perceived as not active and non-productive who would be burdening the welfare state (Mattila 1999; 2003). Thus, the eugenic policies emerged not solely from the race hygiene purposes but also from the design of the welfare state system (Mattila 2003). In the Nordic countries both the so called positive and negative eugenics were introduced including such practices as supporting the "right kind of people" to breed (positive eugenics) as well as sterilization (negative eugenics) (Hietala 2009).

As consequences of eugenic policies to Roma and Travellers have been discussed, sterilization as a eugenic practice has drawn lots of attention. In all the Nordic countries legislation concerning sterilization was in drafting already in the 1920s and enacted by the mid-1930s. Concerned acts were applied for instance in cases where sterilizations were carried out on individuals perceived as criminals or feeble-minded (Hietala 2009). The sterilization policies enabled forced sterilizations but they emphasized the voluntary-ness of sterilizations (Tydén & Broberg 2005; Hietala 2005; Roll-Hansen 2005). However, the "voluntary" sterilizations often involved persuasion and pressure, with making the procedure a condition for instance for eligibility to social benefits or release from institutions such as special schools (SOU 2000; Tydén & Broberg 2005; Haave 2000; Mattila 2005).

These sterilization policies lead also to sterilizations of Roma and Travellers. Researchers are not unanimous on whether Roma-ness and Traveller-ness were systematically used as a criterion for sterilisations. Nevertheless, according to the collective memory of Roma and Travellers they were targeted, and the ones who were sterilized have described this in their accounts (Runcis 2016; Vitbok 2014; NOU 2015; Haave 2000; Tydén & Broberg 2005). Whether or not it was an explicit and systematic aim to sterilize Roma and Travellers, it is clear that many Roma and Travellers were subjected to sterilizations (Mattila 2005; Vitbok 2014; NOU 2015).

Change in the political rhetoric from assimilation and exclusion towards encouragement of the human and cultural rights of Roma and Travellers started after the 1960s. At that time, the policies that Roma and Travellers carried out themselves began gradually to impact the state's policies (Friman-Korpela 2013;

Pulma 2006). Minority rights had emerged on the international agenda, which forced the Nordic countries to adopt a new perspective little by little (Pulma 2006; Tervonen 2012b; Friman-Korpela 2013). The change in the political rhetoric did not, however, simply mean a change to less repressive practices (see Montesino & Ohlsson Al Fakir 2015). The Norwegian government as the only Nordic one has apologized to Travellers in 1998 and 2000 (NOU 2015; St. Meld. 2000 – 2001, 7) and the Roma in 2015 (Government.no 2015) for the historical atrocities.

Nordic Roma policies are entangled historically. After the Second World War, especially when Nordic passport-free travel came into effect, Roma policies were designed and negotiated between Finland, Sweden and Norway in detail (Pulma 2006; Friman-Korpela 2013). Next, I discuss the internationalization of Roma and Traveller policies which has further shaped the national policies and intensified the impact of national policies on each other in the Nordic countries.

2.3 Internationalization of Roma and Traveller policies

Many types of international legal framework, such as the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948), the *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* (1965) and the *Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities* (1992) should now protect and promote the rights of the Roma and Travellers.[9] It is, however, clear that the reality is far removed (see, e.g., Izsák 2015). On top of the legal frameworks which promote the equal treatment of all people, there are now frameworks which specifically promote national minority rights, and policy processes which explicitly promote Roma inclusion/integration (including Travellers). In this section, I will discuss two types of international legal framework which have greatly impacted the context of this study: the Council of Europe's national minority protection and international Roma policies (including Travellers).

After 1989, a political will to regulate ethnic relations and to prevent ethnic conflicts in Europe emerged (see Held 2003), as was manifested in legal minority protection frameworks. In the 1990s, the Council of Europe introduced two legal instruments which several European countries ratified before the turn of the millennium: the Council of Europe Treaty 157, *The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (CoE Treaty 157) which aims at stability, democratic security and peace (CoE Treaty 157, pp.1) and *The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (CoE ETS No. 148), which promotes European democracy and cultural diversity (CoE ETS No. 148, pp.1). Following these legal instruments, many countries granted their long established Roma and

[9] In international law, the protection of minority rights began through the adoption of "minority treaties" by the League of Nations. The United Nations developed further norms, procedures, and mechanisms (UN 2010).

Traveller groups national minority status and acknowledged Romani dialects and variations as minority languages. These two legal instruments are entwined with each other, being designed to protect national minorities and regional and national minority languages.

Beside national minority protection, which often includes Roma and Travellers, Roma and Travellers are also the focus of exclusive attention in European policies (Vermeersch 2006, pp. 187–200). The eastward enlargement of the European Union in particular focused political attention on the Roma in that a condition for the new member states was the provision of protection for their Roma minorities (Bunescu 2014; van Baar 2011; Rövid 2011). These policy processes, have emphasized the Europeanness of the Roma minority (van Baar 2011). Peter Vermeersch (2006, 200; 2012) has demonstrated how this condition had complex consequences: while the political conversation was about improving the living conditions of Roma, the Roma were presented as a problem and even an obstacle to new EU memberships (see also Yıldız & De Genova 2018). Huub van Baar (2012a, 287) has characterized the recent policy development for Roma and Travellers in Europe as unique, the number of substantial social inclusion programmes representing an exceptional case. The Council of Europe's declaration specifically concerning the Roma and the multiple projects on Roma issues the Council of Europe is undertaking are examples of the scale of the inclusion projects (CoE 2010; CoE: Roma and Travellers; CoE 2016). Furthermore, the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe has an *Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area* (OSCE, 2003). The United Nations do not have their own Roma inclusion policy, but the organisation characterizes their work in supporting Roma inclusion as extensive (United Nations 2013). The World Bank has been involved in Roma inclusion/integration in many ways, having for instance produced a *Handbook for Improving the Living Conditions of Roma at the Local Level* (2015) together with the European Commission. Additionally, the European Union has an *EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020*, a coordinated policy process designed to impact national policies. Member States are committed to develop, implement, and monitor *National Roma Integration Strategies* (NRIS) (European Commission 2011).[10] In February 2019, the European Parliament passed a resolution *[O]n the need for a strengthened post-2020 Strategic EU Framework for National Roma Inclusion Strategies and stepping up the fight against anti-Gypsyism* (European Parliament 2019).

While the international policies and efforts can be characterised as plentiful, they have been criticized for their quality. Christina Rodell-Olgaç (2013, 210) points out from the Swedish context that issues still experienced as problematic within Roma communities had already been brought up fifty years ago by Romani

[10] Finland and Sweden are member states whereas Norway is not.

activists. Regardless of the multitude of international policies, we witness anti-Roma discourses and attacks (see, e.g., Rorke 2014). Roma who move or migrate within EU, are especially stigmatised, posited as threats, and dehumanised in public discourse (Kóczé 2018). Throughout Europe there are national projects which seek to exclude Roma and Travellers from nation-states (Yuval-Davis, Wemyss and Cassidy 2017). Furthermore, the *de facto* living conditions of many Roma are still poor (see, e.g., Izsák 2015; Kennedy & Smith 2018). According to the critics, the current international and national policy frameworks are thus inadequate. For instance, Pinar Sayan (2018, 14) concludes that the potential and use of the EU's legislative mechanisms against antigypsyism are insufficient. Margareta Matache (2017) has criticized the European Union's *EU Framework for National Integration Strategies up to 2020* and the national strategies (NRIS) by member states for stemming from racist and biased beliefs about the Roma (for expert knowledge on the Roma see also Picker & Roccheggiani 2014). Huub van Baar (2012b) has claimed that the current ways of making Roma policies depoliticize the policy work as if it was not political but just neutral answers to 'technical problems' (pp. 1301). Depoliticising policy work leads to myriad of problems in policy processes and research. Huub van Baar (2011) also criticizes the ways Roma have become framed as a problem in Europe (see also Vermeersch 2012; Yıldız & De Genova 2018). This notion has back-up from research on media representations on the Roma, especially concerning migrant Roma who are represented as problematic and even dangerous for Europe and who have become used as a "rhetoric devise" to claim control of free movement within the European Union (Yuval-Davis, Varjú, Tervonen, Hakim & Fathi 2017, 1163). Thus, the same depictions that have been produced throughout history of the Roma as external threats to security and nations are still in use and being produced. Peter Vermeersch (2012, 1204) has pointed out that the "Europeanization" of the Roma by European IGOs which has been prevalent may have its drawbacks since it enforces the idea of nation states that the Roma can never be fully part of (see also Yıldız & De Genova 2018). Furthermore, depicting the "Roma" as needing special attention throughout Europe contributes to discourses assuming that it is "the category of 'Roma' itself which mandates special treatment" (Vermeersch 2012, 1205). The critics call for understanding the policies as political as well as for focusing on the marginalizing and discriminatory structures.

I have chosen to study three Nordic countries whose Roma policies are entangled through history, Nordic policy co-operation and larger internationalization of minority and Roma policies. Although the nation states possess the main authority in crafting policy, the influence of international policy processes are strong. The international actors formulating Roma policies have substantial roles in producing the ways of perceiving Roma-related issues (Rövid 2011). Nafsika Alexiadou (2017, 114) claims that the interplay between international and national policies calls for analysis "beyond [the] national level".

Thus, it is important to understand the current national efforts relating to Roma and Travellers and basic education in their international context. The internationalization of Roma and Traveller policies are an inseparable part of the current policy-making. In the next section, I will discuss the current national legislation and policy processes.

2.4 Current Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian policy processes concerning Roma and Travellers

As discussed, Roma and Traveller groups have historically been perceived as not belonging to the Nordic nations, especially since the rise of nation-states. The concept of "nation-state" assumes a fictional form in which the boundaries of a nation and those living in a particular state would correspond (Yuval-Davis, 1997 p. 11). This fiction naturalises the power resources of one collectivity in the state and constructs minorities as deviant from the "norm" (ibid.; see also Anderson 1983). Thus, in the process of nation-state construction, which included the aim of *making* a homogenous "nation", certain groups became defined as being outside the nation (see, e.g., Tervonen 2012a; 2014). Certain groups became minoritised. Defining some Roma and Traveller groups now as national minorities, following CoE Treaty 157, could be perceived as a way of representing these groups as belonging to a nation-state, as nation-state minorities, and national. Thus, the national minority status seems to make some Roma and Travellers visible in the context of nation-states. Will Kymlicka (2006, 8–9) characterises the European invented term "national minority" as referring to "the European groups that lost out in the tumultuous process of European state formation over the past five centuries". But what kind of shape does the national-minority-ness of Roma and Travellers take in Finland, Sweden and Norway?[11]

As already discussed, in Finland, one Roma group – Finnish Roma, Kale – was defined as a national minority. According to Sarita Friman-Korpela (2014, 31), Finland differs from other Nordic countries in its centrally-planned state Roma policies which began to be constructed in the 1950s. In the 1990s, just as the process of ratifying CoE Treaty 157 was taking place, the protection of Finnish Roma language and culture was improving rapidly (Friman-Korpela 2014, 60). The most significant legislative change took place in 1995 when the fundamental rights provisions were reformed and the right of the Roma and other groups to maintain and develop their language and culture was included in the constitution. It is, however, noteworthy that having rights in legislation is different from what it would be were states obliged to execute something (Friman-Korpela 2014, 134). According to Sarita Friman-Korpela (2014, 138–139), there were no wide-ranging discussions about the protection of the Finnish Romani language by the Language

[11] Denmark did not acknowledge their Roma minority as a national minority, which is why I have excluded it from this study.

Charter. Finnish Roma did however raise the concern over whether this would mean that Romani should be open to everyone to learn, which was in contradiction to the tradition of keeping Romani language among the Roma. From the beginning of the 1990s, Finland has had a national as well as regional Roma advisory boards which are covered in legislation. In 2009, Finland released its first national Roma policy.

For a long time, Sweden did not want to recognize Roma or Travellers as distinct minorities (Montesion Parra 2002; Hannikainen 1996). However, when the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (CoE ETS No. 148) was opened for signature in 1995, Sweden started to adjust its legislation to fit this new international commitment. The process led to definitions of national minorities: the report about language minorities also led to legislative changes following CoE Treaty 157 and the protection of national minorities (Wiklander 2015). In the section 2.2 I introduced the trajectories of current policy categories showing the heterogeneity of groups under the category of Swedish national minority Roma. Although there is now one national minority Roma group, the process of defining Swedish national minorities was not straightforward; for instance, some of the Swedish Travellers contested being grouped together with Roma (Wiklander 2015). In January 2007, the Swedish Delegation for Roma Issues was appointed by the government with a temporary mandate (Ju 2006:10) which resulted in national Roma policy, *The coordinated long-term strategy for Roma inclusion 2012–2032* (Skr. 2011)*,* a supplementary policy for the national minority policies. The work with the Swedish Roma strategy started in five pilot municipalities which received funding from the government. Five new development municipalities then received funding for implementing the strategy; the County Administrative Board of Stockholm monitors the Swedish process.

In the 1960s–1970s, the Norwegian state no longer attempted to prevent Norwegian Roma from settling, and began to pay attention to the Roma living conditions (Hasvoll 2015; Hagatun 2019a). In 1972, the Norwegian government introduced a white paper on Roma whose aim was to propose special measures to improve the living conditions of Roma without endangering their identity (Hagatun 2019a). In the 1990s, these measures were however criticized as failing. A new policy direction began by which little or no special measures directed to the Roma were proposed (Hagatun 2019a). At the turn of the millennium, the Roma were defined as one of Norway's national minorities. In 2009, an action plan to improve their living conditions in Oslo was released (AID 2009). Most Norwegian Roma are estimated to live in the Oslo area, which has often made the municipality of Oslo a central actor in Norwegian Roma policies. The assimilation policies towards Norwegian Travellers continued until the 1970s–1980s, when the policies started to change little by little, leading to the national minority status of Travellers at the end of 1990s (NOU 2015). When Norway defined its national minorities, some Norwegian Travellers contested the idea of becoming a national

minority, arguing that the categorisation was yet another stigmatising practice and was a way to introduce disciplinary measures against them (St. Meld. 2000, 46). Norway tabled a green paper about Norwegian Travellers (NOU 2015) in 2015, but this has not led to a policy.

The Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian policy processes about national minority Roma and Traveller groups are impacted by the previously described internationalization of minority rights and European Roma inclusion/integration efforts. The current Finnish and Swedish policy processes seem to have more continuity than the Norwegian ones. This may have partly resulted from the European Union's demand for National Roma Integration Strategies (NRIS) from the member countries (Norway not being an EU member). The first Finnish Roma policy, *The proposal of the working group for a national policy on Roma* (MSAH 2009), was formulated in 2009. This document came to serve as the Finnish NRIS for the European Union Framework. A new Finnish Roma policy, the new Finnish NRIS, *Finland's National Roma Policy (ROMPO) 2018-2022* (MSAH 2018), was released in 2018. In Sweden, the national Roma policy and Swedish NRIS is called, *The coordinated long-term strategy for Roma inclusion 2012–2032* (Skr. 2011). There is currently no specific national Roma or Traveller policy in Norway. There is, however, a white paper on national minorities from 2000, called *National minorities in Norway: About state policy on Jews, Kvens, Roma, Travellers and Forest Finns* (St. Meld 2000). A new white paper on national minorities, planned for release in 2020, is in preparation (Regjeringen.no 2018). *Action plan for improvement of the living conditions of Roma in Oslo* (AID 2009), which deals specifically with the Roma, was released in 2009. However, the action plan has already been evaluated and many of its measures have been rejected (Tyldum & Friberg, 2014; Hagatun 2019a). A new operative policy has not been written for the Roma since the evaluation. A green paper on Traveller policy entitled *Assimilation and resistance in Norwegian policies towards Tater/Romani people from 1850 to the present* (NOU 2015) was also released in 2015. At the end of autumn 2016, the hearings on the green paper ended. It seems now that the green paper will not be converted into a national Traveller policy; however, it will probably be used for formulating the new white paper on national minorities. The national policies on Roma and Travellers are continually under development. Both international frameworks and Nordic co-operation influences the policy processes, which may be characterized as most established in Finland with the permanent national and regional advisory boards on Roma affairs covered by legislation (Friman-Korpela 2014; Finnish government decree 1019/2003). The current Swedish policy is a 20-year plan. In Norway, the policy processes seem more fragmented. One reason, at least in the case of the Roma, seems to be the reluctance to direct policies on the Roma since the previous measures were heavily criticized in the 1990s (Hagatun 2019a).

2.5 Roma, Travellers and basic education in Finland, Sweden and Norway

Education plays a major role in both the international and national Roma and Traveller policies. The promotion of education is perceived to advocate equality, inclusion and human rights (e.g., CoE, 2000; European Commission, 2011; OSCE, 2003; United Nations 2013). Good educational outcomes are entrusted to lead to upward socioeconomic mobility, which will eventually lead to equality (CoE, 2000; European Union, 2012; OSCE, 2003). In this study I am concentrating on policies and practices on basic education, i.e., compulsory education.

Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian basic education (i.e., compulsory education, primary education) resemble each other. Basic education extends over 9 years (in Finland and Sweden) to 10 (in Norway) school starting at age 6 (Norway) and 7 (Finland and Sweden). Most of the students continue to upper-secondary education in these countries. The percentage of young people not in employment, education or training in the 15–19 age group is below the average of OECD (5.8), being 3.0 in Norway; 3.6 in Sweden, and 4.5 in Finland (OECD, 2018).

Finnish, Swedish, and Norwegian basic education is governed by education acts. In Finland, the Basic Education Act (21.8.1998/628) mentions Roma on two occasions, both in connection with the Romani language: the language of instruction in school may be Romani (§10 1. ss.628/1998), and the parent and carer can decide whether the pupil should learn Romani as the mother tongue (§12 2. ss.628/1998). The Swedish Education Act (2010:800) states that a pupil who belongs to a national minority has the right to learn the mother tongue in the pupil's own national minority language. In contrast, the Norwegian Education Act (17 July 1998, no. 61) does not mention Roma or Traveller minorities. Language minorities are only mentioned in sections 2–8 of the Education Act, according to which pupils "who have a mother tongue other than Norwegian or Sami" can have "adapted education in Norwegian" until they are able to follow the general instruction in the language of the school (section 2–8).

Currently, the educational experiences, paths, and outcomes of students who identify as Roma or Travellers in Finland, Sweden, or Norway are distinctive. The number of Roma and Traveller pupils who do not graduate from basic education and who do not apply for secondary education is estimated to be higher than the average for the population (AID 2009; MSAH 2009; NOU 2015; SOU 2010). Prejudice, racism, and negative attitudes towards Roma and Traveller pupils as well as bullying have been reported (Junkala & Tawah 2009; NOU 2015; Rajala & Blomerus 2015; Rajala, Salonen, Blomerus, & Nissilä 2011; SOU 2010). Education has historically been used to eradicate Romani languages and cultures (Engebrigtsen 2015; Lund 2010; Montesino Parra 2002; Pulma 2006; Rodell Olgaç 2006, 2013; Selling 2014; Sjögren 2010). Following the turn in Roma

policies toward human rights and ethnic minority protection after the 1960s, there have been multiple projects and measures concerning Roma, Travellers and basic education.

In Finland, it has been estimated that Roma children started to attend basic education more regularly in the 1960s (Syrjä & Valtakari 2008, 45). Based on a national survey among adult Roma, Susanna Rajala and Satu Blomerus (2015, 87) state however that the actual "integration" into the education system started as late as the 1990s. The change in educational patterns is connected to structural changes in Finnish society (rapid urbanization), an active Roma housing policy in the 1970s, Roma activism and change in the societal discourse about the Roma (Tervonen 2012b; Syrjä& Valtakari 2008; Rajala & Blomerus 2015). According to surveys conducted by the Finnish National Agency of Education, Roma families want their children to be educated and regard schooling as a self-evident part of life (Rajala & Blomerus 2015; Rajala, Salonen, Blomerus & Nissilä 2011; see also Markkanen 2003). The school outcomes of Roma pupils are, however, still divergent: the number of pupils not graduating or applying to upper secondary education is higher than average (Rajala et. al. 2011). The Roma education group in the Finnish National Agency of Education (FNAE) has done active work with the basic education of Roma children by, for instance, providing materials for Romani language teaching. FNAE has also distributed government subsidies for municipalities to develop support for those Roma children who need it. The subsidies have permitted for instance the Roma mediator practice to develop further locally (Rajala 2011).

In Sweden, the basic education of Roma and Travellers has likewise become more stabilised since the 1970s (Rodella-Olgaç 2007). Before the 1970s, they were placed in parallel arrangements within school system such as "helpschools" and special classes or they were forbidden to attend school (AMD 2014; Montesino Parra 2002; Rodell Olgaç 2013; 2007; Sjögren 2010). Historically, schooling explicitly aimed for the assimilation of Roma and Travellers (Montesino Parra 2002). According to Christina Rodell-Olgaç (2013; 2007), between the 1970s and 2000 Roma were expected to accommodate themselves to the Swedish schools. Romani children and families were still perceived as insufficient and their culture was considered to cause problems in school. Since the 1990s, the Swedish National Agency of Education (SNAE) has conducted surveys about the educational situation of Roma pupils. In 2007, SNAE concluded that Roma pupils (including Travellers) were a very heterogenous group, a number of them not indicating in school that they are Roma. SNAE states that various measures need to be found together with the Roma to improve the school attendance of those Roma pupils who have problems (SNAE 2007). In 2004 and 2005, the children's Ombudsman interviewed Roma pupils and reported the interviewees' experiences of exclusion based on their ethnicity at school (Barnombudsmannen 2005). Until autumn 2018, there was a specific "Roma

culture class" in the Stockholm area, which was taken by Roma teachers combining education in Romani and Swedish. (Rodell Olgaç 2013). This class, started in the 1990s, was an initiative by Roma teachers and Roma communities in the area. The Stockholm municipality, however, decided to close the class in autumn 2018 after receiving criticism of the quality of the education from the Swedish school inspectorate (SVT Nyheter 2016; 2017). Today, the basic education of Roma is promoted, and measures have been developed at municipal level, following the national Roma strategy. However, according to the County Administrative Board of Stockholm, more municipalities should be implementing the national Roma strategy (Länsstyrelsen Stockholm 2018). SNAE, following the national Roma strategy, has also developed materials about the Roma for schools (e.g. SNAE: Stödpaket f.d.). Furthermore, the national Roma strategy has obliged SNAE together with the National Board of Health and Welfare to provide education for Roma mediators (brobyggare). The mediator education has been carried out at Södertörn university (Rodell Olgaç & Dimiter-Taikon 2016) and is being evaluated annually (SNAE 2019).

In Norway, assimilation policies, in which school has had a significant role, have been harsh. The school outcomes of Traveller children have still been found to be divergent, exhibiting the same tendencies as Finnish and Swedish Roma: a higher risk of dropping out and not applying for upper secondary education (see Lund 2010). After the ratification of CoE Treaty 157, the rights of Traveller pupils have been discussed from a new perspective. Some people identifying as Traveller want to travel for some of the year, which is typically the issue raised in relation to school attendance of Traveller children as well as Norwegian Roma children. The national minority status protects this cultural right to some extent although, according to Anne Bonnevie Lund & Bente Bolme Moen (2013), many teachers do not know this. There have been projects trying out the use of computers for helping the Traveller children to learn if travelling during school year (Bolme Moen 2009; Bonnevie Lund 2010; Bonnevie Lund & Bolme Moen 2013). When the 1970s special measures for Norwegian Roma were introduced, one of the measures was a separate school for Roma (*sigøynerskole*), which was part of a larger measure called *sigøynerkontoret* ("Gypsy office") (Hasvoll 2015; Hagatun 2019a). Later the Roma school was perceived as too segregated and specific Roma classes were established within Oslo schools (Engebrigtsen 2015). In the 1990s, the "Gypsy Office" was closed and the separate educational arrangements ended. Roma pupils were integrated into general classes offering the opportunity to apply for extra money for each of their Roma pupils (Hagatun 2019a). When the new action plan about the living conditions of Roma was introduced in 2009, no clear measures directed to basic education were introduced (AID 2009). The municipality of Oslo established "The Department of Roma measures" to carry out the policy measures of the action plan (see Oslo kommune 2012). In 2012, the department introduced a measure called "Romlostjenesten" to support Roma

pupils and families at school (Tyldum & Friberg 2014; Hagatun 2019a). The people in question were not Roma themselves. Furthermore, there were some Roma mediators employed for a project to introduce Roma history and culture to schools (Oslo kommune 2012; Hagatun 2019a). Nowadays, the Department of Roma measures has been closed down but "Romlostjensten" is still under development and a group of "Romlos" who are non-Roma and mediator/assistants who are Roma are now working to improve the basic education of Roma children in Oslo (Hagatun 2019a).

The history of schooling of Roma and Travellers in Finland, Sweden, and Norway is tied to the stigmatised and subordinated positions of the Roma and Traveller groups within each of these societies. After the international and national changes in Roma and minority politics and policies, basic education has been tasked with Roma inclusion and minority rights protection. In the national level these have been promoted by the current Roma and Traveller policies proposing measures in basic education. As described above, multiple measures are developed and carried out locally and the practices of promoting education of Roma and Travellers are constantly undergoing change. This study concentrates on these policies and practices in Roma, Travellers and basic education. In the next chapter I discuss the research objective and methodology of the study.

3 Research objective and choices in theories and methodology

This research has been carried out in the intersections between multiple disciplines such as education, sociology, feminist studies, studies on ethnic relations and minority research. I draw the theoretical approach of the study from three interdisciplinary terrains of theoretical thinking which I refer to as: i) feminism ii) poststructuralism and iii) critical theories on race and whiteness. With my theoretical framework I attempt to question and reformulate the ways Roma, Travellers and education are perceived both in policies and often in academic research. My intention has been to ask questions that "produce different knowledge and produce knowledge differently" (St. Pierre & Pillow 2000, 1); I have aimed to build up a theoretical framework which allows us to conceptualise and analyse how power functions in the current policies and practices in the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian contexts. In this section, I position this research within its theoretical and methodological terrain. I start by introducing the objective of this research.

3.1 Research objective

The objective of this study is to analyse what kind of power relations and subjectivities are enabled and constrained in the current policies on and practices of basic education of Roma and Travellers in Finland, Sweden and Norway.

I respond to the research objective by posing the following research questions:

RQ1. What kind of representations of problems are constituted by the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian policy measures on Roma, Travellers and basic education? (Publication I)

RQ2. What kind of subject constitution and agency is enabled and constrained for the Finnish Roma mediators by the current discursive terrain concerning prejudice and tolerance in schools? (Publication II)

RQ3. How does the discursive terrain around the practice of providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers in schools function? (Publication III)

3.2 Theoretical choices intended to open up spaces to think differently: Feminism, poststructuralism and critical theories on race and whiteness

In my theoretical thinking, feminism, poststructuralism and critical theories on race and whiteness work side by side and inform each other. Recently critical studies on Roma issues have been drawing from feminist studies (e.g., Corradi 2018; Hinton-Smith, Danvers & Jovanovic 2017; Kóczé 2009), critical studies about race and whiteness (e.g., Matache 2015; Yıldız, Can & De Genova, Nicholas 2018) as well as from poststructuralism (e.g., van Baar 2016). I start this section by introducing feminism and poststructuralism side by side and move on to make the connection with critical theories on race and whiteness. The theoretical spheres are not clear-cut and my form of presenting the various lines of thought does not represent the ways these traditions have emerged. It does not reflect the relations between these traditions either. However, the presentation mirrors the ways the theoretical threads have become part of my thought and my research.

In the Nordic educational research, feminist theories are often deployed for the analysis of difference and inequalities in education (e.g., Gordon, Holland & Lahelma 2000; From & Sahlström 2016; Lappalainen 2006; Lehtonen 2017; Kurki 2019; Mietola 2014; Tolonen 2012; Odenbring 2019). When I was a BA student and a research assistant in the *Cultural and feminist education research group* (KUFE), led by professor Elina Lahelma, I learned of both feminist and poststructural research. There is a large body of research in which the theoretical spheres of feminism and poststructuralism inform each other and work side by side in the context of education (e.g., Angervall 2018; Davis 2004; Hakala 2007; Ikävalko 2016; Mietola 2014; St. Pierre & Pillow 2000; St. Pierre 2000; Youdell 2006 a & b). Those theoretical discussions have informed the ways I ask questions and think about knowledge, research, theory, methods and data.

For me, feminist thought represents interdisciplinary research which analyses (gendered) power relations, hierarchies and norms and has an explicit political commitment to unsettle them (Ahmed 2017). Much of the feminist research has expanded into analysis of various differences, norms and power while having gender in focus (Liljeström 2004; hooks 2015). Black feminists such as Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) and bell hooks (1981) have emphasized that gender cannot be understood without looking at multiple dimensions of difference like race and class, and this line of thought currently remains strong in feminist theory. Sara Ahmed (2017) claims that feminism *has to be* intersectional feminism since phenomena such as sexism cannot be understood without analysing such things as racism. According to bell hooks (2015, xiv), feminist theory needs to be under construction: "fluid", "open" and "responsive to new information". In fact, feminist theories intersect and intertwine with other critical thought such as

critical theories of race and whiteness, queer studies and disability studies. Although I am not analysing gender *per se*, the poststructural and intersectional feminist theories inform the analysis of difference, norms and power.

Like feminism, "poststructuralism" may also be characterized as open-ended. The theories themselves problematize language and meaning, and authors with a poststructural take find often themselves in trouble with the demand to define concepts and theories. However, poststructuralism typically refers to "a movement in philosophy" from the 1960s (Williams 2015, 1), which has influenced many disciplines such as feminism, sociology, education and arts. Patti Lather (2007, 5) characterises "poststructuralism" as referring

> [t]o a sense of the limits of Enlightenment rationality. It particularly foregrounds the limits of consciousness and intentionality and the will to power inscribed in sense-making efforts that aspire to totalizing explanatory frameworks, especially structuralism with its ahistoricism and universalism.

What Patti Lather describes as "a sense of the limits of Enlightenment theory", Elisabeth Adams St. Pierre (2000, 57) characterizes as "a continuation of an ongoing skepticism about humanism and its effects". St. Pierre emphasizes the relation between poststructuralism and humanism and characterizes poststructuralism as delineating some of the central concepts in "humanism" such as subject, knowledge and power in a new way (St. Pierre 2000). [12] It can be said that in many of those theoretical takes that are characterized as poststructuralism, subject, its constitution and possibilities for agency are (re-)theorized. The complex formation of subject, knowledge and what we can think and say are at the heart of my study.

The third theoretical area I draw from is critical theories on race and whiteness, a broad description of multiple theories which overlap with each other and even with feminism and poststructuralism (and of course with completely different lines of thought). I refer to thinking such as Nordic postcolonial and whiteness studies (e.g., Hübinette 2017; Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012; Mulinari et al. 2009), decolonization (e.g., Boatcâ et al. 2010) and critical race theory (e.g., Ladson-Billings 1998). Although feminism and poststructuralism provide tools to analyse how multiple differences and power work, the questions of race and whiteness are also specific phenomena that need to be addressed as such. Using critical theories of race and whiteness I aim to grasp the specific discourses and forms of power that are historically, culturally and socially constituted around "race". In this study

[12] There is no straightforward definition of humanism (Davies 1996). Elisabeth Adams St. Pierre (2000) uses the concept of "humanism" to refer to the tradition of thought where the human subject is believed to find "the truth" through reasoning and to the knowledge projects that have emerged from that perception of human being.

I argue, alongside with previous research (such as Lentin 2004; Goldberg 2006; Mulinari et al. 2009) that neither Europe nor the Nordic countries can be understood without scrutinising their race relations; race as an ideological construction posits Roma and Travellers as well (Miskovic 2009; Yıldız & De Genova 2018).

Reading feminism, poststructuralism and critical theories on race and whiteness side by side does not proceed without eventual conflicts. For instance, both among feminism and critical theories on race and whiteness a worry about poststructuralism re-centering white males as the origin of thought has been raised. Furthermore, poststructuralism has been accused of making political action impossible by questioning subject and agency and for delegitimizing marginalized voices (Hill Collins 2000a). In this study, these theories have been used as informing each other and resonating together as they have been used in the extensive body of previous research. From poststructuralism informed by feminism I draw the concepts of *subjectification*, *discourse* and *power*. From critical theories of race and whiteness I draw the concepts of *race*, *racialization*, *racism* and *whiteness* especially, which in my theoretical perspective are entangled with the concepts of discourse, power and subjectification as will be discussed below. After presenting these concepts, I will move on to discussing my methodology, which combines ideas and concepts from the above-mentioned strands of theories.

3.2.1 Possible subjectivities: Discourse, power and subject constitution

The startingpoint of this research is the poststructural notion that discourses enable and constrain our thinking and acting (Bacchi 2010; Foucault 1972; St Pierre 2000).[13] Joan W. Scott defines discourse as a specific structure of "statements, terms, categories and beliefs" that are bound "historically, socially and institutionally" (Scott 1988, pp. 33). Furthermore, discourses can be characterised as knowledge formations in that discourse enables some statements to be understood as truthful and intelligible whereas others are incomprehensible or false (Butler 1997b; St. Pierre 2000; Ball 2015). Discourses limit and enable the ways we can think of a "given social object or practice" (McHoul and Grace 1993, 31) and we thus make sense of the world within the available discourses (Davies 2006). Using of the concept of discourse we are able to analyse the relations between history, social surroundings and institutions (see also Bove 1990) around "a given social object or practice" and contextualise how certain statements become "sayable" in the current conditions. (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016, 116; Butler 1997b; Foucault 1991). In this study, the "given social object or practice" is what

[13] Discourse does not refer only to language. For further discussion about language and materialism in poststructural theories of discourse see Bacchi & Bonham 2014.

I have called "policies and practices about the Roma, Travellers and basic education in Finland, Sweden and Norway".

Power is entangled in discourse. Power is considered productive. According to Foucault (1980, 98):

> Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or a piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between the threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation.

In discourse, knowledge and power become intertwined, forming centres of power-knowledge (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016; Foucault 1978).

One articulation and form of relations of power is that of subject constitution, i.e., subjectification (Butler 1997a; Foucault 1980; 1983).[14] Power is thus not thought of as something negative that hinders subjects who exist freely prior to power, but relations of power are understood as forming and producing the subject; power provides the conditions of the existence of the subject (Foucault 1980; 1983; Butler 1997a). The individual is rendered as a subject and is subjected to relations of power through discourses, i.e., historically, socially and institutionally bound knowledge formations and sets of practices (Davies 2006; Youdell 2006a; Phoenix 2009). Subjectification is an ambivalent process in which submission and mastery paradoxically take place concurrently in the same acts: subjecthood is available in simultaneous submission to and mastery of discourses (Davies 2006; Butler 1997a). In that ambivalent process of subject constitution, "the mutual acts of recognition" between continuously becoming subjects are vital for possible subjecthood (Davies 2006, 427).

The reason for the use of the theoretical take proposed here is that it provides tools to focus on the discursive conditions of the current policies, practices and actions taken. I want to emphasise the conditioned nature of any action such as claims-making, development of practices or policy-making and the way discourses signify and produce objects. One cannot choose the discourses that one is dependent on for one's existence, and the *agency* of a subject is thus bound (Butler 1997a). The agency of an individual is initiated and sustained by the discourses that render the subject. Agency emerges when discourses are renewed. Renewal of discourses is when they may be renewed differently, resignified (Butler 1995, 135–136). In other words, in the ambivalent process of

[14] The research literature also use 'subjectivation' or 'subjection'.

subjectification where power is reiterated, power appears in the agency of a subject and, although conditioned by power, the becoming subject may reiterate power in a manner counter to and non-assumed by the logic of the power relations (Butler 1997a, 12-15). Thus, although or because "one is always 'inside' power", there is always the possibility of resistance: "points of resistance" are omnipresent in "the power network" (Foucault 1978, 95). Where and how resistance happens is not predefined (Foucault 1997a). Forms of resistance, however, often involve complicity since one cannot act outside the relations of power (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016, 112) and subject constitution and agency depends on the existing discourses and relations of power (Butler 1997a).[15]

My research objective is to focus on the relations of power in the current policies and practices and on the *subjectivities* that are enabled and constrained. By subjectivity I mean the individual's "sense of self" (Weedon 2004, 18) and the sense of relations between the self and others (Weedon 1987) which is constituted through the processes of subjectification; thus, in the play of relations of power (Davies 1993). Subjectivity as a sense of self is not fixed or solid but is always becoming through power/discourse (Davies 1993, 9–10). Following the theory of subject constitution, subjectivity is shaped and conditioned by relations of power. Thus I am asking what kinds of sense of self and relations of self and the others are made possible in the policies and practices. I understand these subjectivities as articulations of the relations of power.

3.2.2 Race, racism, racialization and whiteness

> Conceptually 'race' is not a scientific category. The differences attributable to 'race' within a population are as great as that between racially defined populations. 'Race' is a political and social construct. It is the organizing discursive category around which has been constructed a system of socio-economic power, exploitation and exclusion – i.e. racism. (Hall 2000, 222)

At the outset of my doctoral studies, a distinguished scholar asked me how it is possible for me to use the concept of race and whether I did not know what kind of atrocities have been committed against the Roma based on the idea of biological human races.[16] Although I was surprised at the way the question was posed, it

[15] The possibility for agency in all postmodern theories is often criticized. For further discussion of political agency in postmodern theories, see Tuija Pulkkinen 2003.

[16] There is a custom, especially in the Nordic countries, to use the concept of race in citations to emphasise constantly the fabricated non-biological basis of race. This custom, however, has begun to crumble and race has come to be treated like other concepts – thus not in need of a regular reminder of its nature as constituted in discursive practices (e.g., Vuolajärvi 2014; Hübinette 2017).

was certainly understandable in terms of the heavy burden of the concept. Adapting the concept of race to research today in an ethical manner is not a simple task (Gunaratnam 2003) and there are debates among the researchers in race and ethnic studies about the use of the concept and whether it can be deployed in ways which do not reinforce racism (see, e.g., Gilroy 1998; Banton 2015). [17] Alana Lentin (2005) argues that after World War II the concept of 'race' became widely rejected and replaced by concepts such as 'culture' and 'ethnicity'. Behind this rejection was an assumption that by denying the notion of human races and removing the concept of race, racism disappears (Lentin 2005; Lentin 2008; Hall 2000; Goldberg 2006). Many scholars and activists, however, find that if we do not talk about race as an "organizing discursive category" as Stuart Hall (2000, 222) puts it, we actually hide and depoliticize racism – the "system of socio-economic power, exploitation and exclusion" – which is being constructed around the discursive category of race (Lentin 2005; 2008; Ahmed 2000 pp. 95–113; 2002). As Sara Ahmed (2004, 48) puts it "[r]ace exists as an effect of histories of racism as histories of the present". Rikke Andreassen and Uzma Ahmed-Andresen (2013) have argued that when we lack vocabulary for race in the Nordic countries it inhibits the potential to make racial discrimination visible and challenge it (see also Molina 2005). Characteristic, in fact, for the discursive category of race today is that it often works without referring explicitly to race but works in and through disparate references (Goldberg 2015; Valluvan 2016) such as 'culture', 'ethnicity', 'nationality, 'religion' or 'security' to name but a few. In public discussions, racism (and explicit references to race) is widely condemned and understood as something a few bad individuals may indulge, but which amounts to just an echo from the past historical times of racism (Lentin 2008; Goldberg 2006; 2015). David Theo Goldberg (2015) among others has argued that the claim that race and racism do not matter anymore is characteristic of present day racism. The discourse of "tolerance" is one such discourse which depoliticizes the power relations which are embedded in that discourse (Hage 2000). Silence about race makes it difficult to analyse and resist racism as an ideology embedded in the societies (Lentin 2005).

How, then, race is conceptualized in research varies greatly. In sociology and philosophy, a classic theorist about race and racism is W.E.B Du Bois. Much has happened in the research, but Du Bois's type of sociological and philosophical interest in socio-historical construction of "race" which organizes our societies

[17] In this study I use the concept of "racism" instead of "antigypsyism". Antigypsyism is a term that has been adopted to refer to racism particularly towards the Roma (see, e.g., Antigypsyism.eu (n.d.); Hirsto Kyuchukov (2012) (ed.) "New Faces of Antigypsyism in Modern Europe".). In this research, however, I deploy theorisations about race and racism which do not discuss antigypsyism specifically. Connecting my research to general theorisations of race and racism does not mean that I reject the term antigypsyism. I deploy the concept of racism instead of antigypsyism for clarity in the theoretical framework.

and is rooted in history (e.g., Du Bois 1897; 1940/2007; see also Gooding-Williams 2018), is still central to studies of race and ethnicity. My conceptualisation of race is entangled with poststructuralism (Hall 2000; Chadderton 2018; Youdell 2006a; Gunaratnam 2003) and I frame race with the help of poststructural reading of the concepts of discourse, power, and subject constitution. I understand race as a discursive category which is socially, historically, and culturally constituted (Hall 2000). In this study, I perceive race and the ways it functions as unfixed and unstable: race and its meanings are constituted within and upheld through discourses (or discursive practices) and has subjectivating effects (Gunaratnam 2003; Chadderton 2018). The ways race is maintained through discourses are intertwined with other dimensions of difference such as gender, sexuality and social class; it is thus intersectional (Crenshaw 1989; Ahmed 2017).

This type of poststructural take on race has, however, been criticized for silencing individuals and political movements based on racial identities by arguably denying these identities and thus the voices of people with marginalized racial identities (e.g., Collins 2000a). I recognize this tension and, drawing on Yasmin Gunaratnam (2003, 6), I aim to "legitimate the situated voices" while analysing the discursive conditions of subjectivities.

Drawing from the discussion above, the viewpoint of my research is that discourses produce race without naming it and I argue that this is how the discursive category of race works in the policies and practices on Roma and Travellers. But to analyse something that is not named, we need more concepts, a central concept for my analysis being *racialization*. I use racialization as an analytic concept for understanding of how race is "made to mean" (Lentin 2008, 37) and, like Sara Ahmed (2002, 47), I understand race as an "effect of racialization". The concept of racialization was applied to a great extent since the developments by Robert Miles (1989; 1993), according to whom (Miles 1989, 74), Franz Fanon (2003) was the first one to use the term racialization in his book *Wretched of the Earth* in 1961.[18] The use of the concept has changed over time and through different contexts (Barot & Bird 2001). Today, racialization is referred to and used so widely in research that some scholars have argued that as a theoretical concept it has become vague and non-analytical (e.g., Murji & Solomos 2005; Goldberg 2006). In my analysis, racialization refers to the ways race as a social and political category is signified, established and maintained. Processes of racialization construct and stabilise categories of the Other, in this case Roma and Travellers, associating certain differences with these categories. The attributes typically associated with the Other contain negative signifiers, and

[18] However, Barot and Bird (2001) claim that the term was introduced already by the end of 19th century, but the critical reintroduction which took flight was by Franz Fanon and Robert Miles.

the Other is represented as inadequate or threatening[19] as descriptions of Roma and Travellers historically have been (see chapter 2) and currently are, especially at European level (Yıldız & De Genova 2018). The perceived differences between "us" and the Other begin to seem natural and essential and racialised power relations become legitimised (Mulinari et al. 2009; Lentin 2008).

Suvi Keskinen and Rikke Andreassen (2017, 66) argue that "racialisation is a relational process, where whiteness often acts as the unspoken norm against which 'others' are measured and defined". Thus, when we analyse race, we need to understand how whiteness works (see also Ahmed 2007; Lorde 1984). In this research, I understand whiteness as a norm and privilege which is a production of history (of colonialism), which posits individuals and which functions in the maintaining of the discursive category of race (Ahmed 2007; Wekker 2016). Sara Ahmed (2007, 150) described whiteness as "an effect of racialization". Thus, as race according to Ahmed (2002) is an effect of racialization, whiteness is as well. "Whiteness works precisely by assigning race to others" (Ahmed 2004, 1). Whiteness, race and racialization are thus interlinked, as Keskinen and Andreassen argue. I see whiteness as a norm that is maintained through racialization and which privileges those who are understood as white (cf. Lorde 1984). In the Nordic context, whiteness possesses an important role in the production of national identities: construction of Finnish-ness, Swedish-ness and Norwegian-ness are connected to being white (Bayati 2014; Fylkesnes 2019; Hübinette 2012; Juva & Holm 2017; Lundström & Teitelbaum 2017). In the Nordic countries, there is also a self-perception of exceptional national homogeneity (Keskinen, Skaptadóttir & Toivanen, 2019), as well as exceptional innocence in relation to colonialism and racism (Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012; Mulinari et. al 2009). Nordic postcolonial and critical race scholars have, however, begun to deconstruct these presuppositions of the Nordic nations (e.g., Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012; Mulinari et. al. 2009; Hübinette 2017). The Nordic countries, their discourses of nations, nation-states, the world order and humanity are structured by historical deeply rooted racism produced in and through colonialism (e.g., Bayati 2014; Hübinette 2012; Hübinette & Lundström 2014; Molina 2005). The specific forms of these discourses in the Nordic countries have been studied, and also my research is an attempt to contribute to understanding how race, racialization, and whiteness works in the Nordic countries.

Going back to answer the question posed by the scholar about why use the concept of race: it is to apply the theoretizations about race and whiteness in the analysis of the power relations and subjectivities in the policies and practices. As described in chapter 2.3, Margaret Matache (2017b) has argued that the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies and the national strategies

[19] Although the process of racialization is always differentiating, the signifiers attached to the categories of the Other are not always negative; they may also for instance represent exoticising or desire (see, e.g., Ahmed 2002; Hall 1999).

rely on racist beliefs about the Roma. Nira Yuval-Davies, Georgie Wemyss & Kathryn Cassidy (2017, 1049) have argued that racialization of the Roma is connected to the politics of belonging which construct the Roma as an "other" (see also Yuval-Davis 2011). The ways race works applied to the Roma and is made to mean needs to be addressed by researchers, policy-makers and educators (Miskovic 2007; Yıldız & De Genova 2018). When we are silent about race, we reinforce white privilege and provide fertile ground for racism (Lentin 2008; Goldberg 2015). The work of race in concepts which seem innocent such as culture, ethnicity or tolerance need to be unpacked (Hall 2000; Lentin 2008; Goldberg 2006).

3.3 Knowledge trouble and the ruins of methodology: Methodology drawn from poststructuralism, feminism, critical theories on race and whiteness

> This is about the "ruins" of methodology, the end of transcendent claims and grand narratives: methodology under erasure. (Lather 2007, 2)

> Knowledge is not a systematic tracking down of a truth that is hidden but may be found (Spivak, 1974, p. xix).

By methodology I mean ways of generating valid knowledge with the use of theories and research methods (Liljeström 2004). So the question is with what kind of methodology, i.e., theories and methods guiding the research process, can I generate knowledge about subjectivities and power relations in policies and practices concerning the Roma, Travellers and education in these three countries? As the title of this section indicates, I understand my methodology consisting of theories, ideas and thinking in poststructuralism, feminism and critical race and whiteness studies – side by side, informing each other and intersecting. As I have written, knowledge, truth, and research methods are problematized by the theoretical thoughts this research draws from. Thus the elements that are central to research methodology are under critical gaze. In the next two sections, I discuss the epistemological commitments of this research and present the methods of inquiry: interviews, participant observations, and policy analysis.

3.3.1 Knowledge as situated and partial

I see research as a discursive practice (Gunaratnam 2003) or as a set of discursive practices. Thus, research becomes within discourses and in knowledge formations produced in relations of power. The research(er) does not have a position external to the relations of power it studies, investigates and resists. The knowledge

research produces does not capture "the truth" through the methods, knowledge being partial, situated and enabled and bound by the context (see, e.g., Spivak 1974, pp. xix). Production of "knowledge" is thus under suspicion in my theoretical framework (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016, 35).

In qualitative research in human sciences there are many ways of understanding research. I posit my transnational and translocal poststructural, feminist and critical race and whiteness research methodology in that qualitative research tradition which has questioned foundationalism[20] and "gone through" "the crisis of representation" [21] . There is no one clear description of all epistemological discussions, "turns" and their interrelatedness within human sciences, the nature of scientific knowledge being under constant debate (Lather 2007). The epistemological perspectives of human science went through profound changes after the Second World War when the nature of knowledge and knowledge production in human/social sciences were debated (Steinmetz 2005). Scholars in particular criticised "positivism"[22] in qualitative research (St. Pierre 2014). Today, however, a continuous critical discussion about ontology and epistemology reflects the ways qualitative research is under the pressure of making the research "look" "scientific" according to the rules of the physical sciences. Elisabeth Adams St. Pierre (2014, 1) finds this pressure towards "positivizing" qualitative methodology surprising in terms of the history of qualitative research and its many ontological and epistemological "turns". According to Erickson (2018, 55), this compulsion to shape qualitative research towards the rules of the "hard sciences" is especially apparent in applied sciences such as education. Erickson further argues that applied sciences especially seek legitimation by shaping research as relevant and proximate for policy-making. The discourse of policy-making then, according to Erickson, is "grounded in 'hard-science' assumptions regarding research ontology, epistemology, and methodology" (2015, 55) and influences research closely tied to policy-making. One field of research interlinked with policy making is "minority research", where

[20] Foundationalism, a crucial part of modern theoretical thought, seeks for the foundation under all the layers. Whereas in postmodern thought (thus in the thought which questions what became known as "modern"), the idea of the foundation which could be revealed is abandoned and the focus is on those layers and their functioning which the foundational thought tries to bypass to find "the core". (Pulkkinen 2003)

[21] By "crisis of representation" I mean the discussions which gained force in the 1960s about how and whether social "reality" can be described and represented in research (Marcus & Fischer 1986). According to Patti Lather (2007, 119), the crisis of representation in poststructuralism can be understand as "the end of pure presence" and troubling essence. The crisis of representation comes down to the relationship between "the object" and knowledge production about the object which has been articulated in many disciplines in a multitude of ways (Popoviciu et. al. 2006)

[22] Rejecting "positivism" also means constructing what is imagined to be "positivism". Thus discussions rejecting "positivism" often describe what they are rejecting rather than referring to "positivism" (for further discussion, see George Steinmetz (ed.). (2005). The politics of method in the human sciences: positivism and its epistemological others.)

the policy-making discourses have impacted the theoretical frameworks, the premises of research, and the questions asked (Araujo 2014; Essed & Nimako 2006). Thus, a great deal of the research focusing on Roma is closely connected to or even intertwined with policy-making (Bogdán, Ryder & Taba 2015; Pulma 2006). The practices of research on the Roma have constituted them as a homogenous, problematic group and an object of study (Araujo 2014; Surdu 2016) and, historically, the Roma have had little opportunity to influence the kind of questions posed about them or how issues related to them are studied (see Vajda 2015).

Although postfoundationalist ontologies and "positivizing" of research are not compatible, both are often present, wittingly or unwittingly, in research conducted by a qualitative researcher (St. Pierre 2014; Denzin & Lincoln 2018; Harding 2005). I have experienced these two "forces" pulling me in the course of my research, both within the research community and within me. I understand these "pulls" as observations of how research as a discursive practice in power networks becomes constituted. I comprehend these sensations of pulling as my negotiation with what can currently be recognized and accepted as knowledge. I have "intellectually" committed to poststructural, feminist and critical thinking on race and whiteness and I understand qualitative research as messy, partial, and situated discursive practice. However, while conducting my sub-studies, I have found myself wondering in a policy-oriented research language: "what are the policy implications of my research?"; "what kind of policy recommendations could I make?" or, as in the example I gave in the introduction, "yes, yes, racialization, but what *should be done*?" The policy oriented research language is also connected to my research funding from NordForsk's Centre of Excellence whose one task is to produce policy recommendations (see NordForsk 2018).[23] Some journal/book peer-reviewers of my texts have also pushed the texts towards policy recommendations and I find the negotiations with proximity to policy-making and "positivising" colouring my publications.

As already established, in poststructural thought knowledge is entangled with power and is enabled and constrained by what can be said and thought in different times and places. Thus knowledge and what is accepted as knowledge becomes constituted in discourses (Foucault 1972; St. Pierre 2000 & Pillow; Lather 2007). In feminist methodology, knowledge and knowing are understood as contextual and tied to person, place and time as well as to the feminist community and to the chosen epistemology (Liljeström 2004, 11). In feminist thought, there is an abundance of perspectives, but what is often shared in the methodology is the perspective on knowledge as situated (Liljeström 2004; Haraway 1988; Harding 2004). I find that this perception resonates with poststructural thinking in its

[23] NordForsk is an organization which works under the Nordic Council of Ministers and distributes funding for Nordic research.

troubling of the practices of knowledge production, although in feminism the nature of knowledge is widely discussed in other theoretical realms than poststructuralism (see, e.g., Harding 2005). Knowledge production has also been troubled in critical theories on race and whiteness: white people dominating the research agendas and non-white people being made objects or invisible to research (e.g., Nimako 2012; Collins 2000b; 2004; Matache 2017a). Thus, the whiteness norm is renewed through knowledge production (see also Ahmed 2002). Both in feminism and in critical studies on race and whiteness (which often overlap) an important project has been to show whose knowledge has been and is understood as knowledge and what kind of research has even been found relevant (e.g., Haraway 1988; Harding 2005; Lorde 1984; Matache 2017a; Mohanty 1984; 2003; Vajda 2015). Furthermore, postcolonial theories and decolonization in particular have questioned scientific knowledge, what is understood as knowledge, and how colonialism is present in the scientific knowledge production (e.g., Gutiérrez-Rodríguez 2010; Said 2011).

These epistemological considerations about knowledge are an attempt to avoid reproducing problematic representations of Roma and Travellers and to challenge whiteness as a norm and racism within Romani studies. The history of research about Roma and Travellers is problematic (see Acton 2016; Matache 2017a; Surdu 2016; Vajda 2015; Mirga-Kruszelnicka 2015). White, non-Roma/non-Traveller researchers have been imposing identities on Roma and Travellers, producing othering racializing descriptions of them (Matache 2017a; see also Miskovic 2009; Surdu 2016). Knowledge has also been tightly linked to politics and policy-making. Thus, it is imperative to consider the nature of knowledge in analysing policies and practices about Roma and Traveller groups and to be reflexive in the process of knowledge production.

What research about the Roma is also strongly been criticized for is the negligible opportunities for Roma participation in knowledge production (Bogdán, Dunajeva, Jungahaus, Kóczé, Rövid, Rostas, Ryder, Szilvási & Taba 2015). Poststructuralism, however, has been criticized for diminishing situated voices, thus the situated knowledge produced by marginalized groups (e.g., Collins 2000a). From this point of view, the poststructural perspective could be considered as silencing the research participants who identify as Roma or Travellers. I find, however, that the representation of the research phenomenon is inevitably constructed by the researcher in and through discourses (see, e.g., Britzman 2000). By writing in the first person I emphasise the fact that "I" am present in the knowledge production of the phenomenon of the study which can also be challenged (Mietola 2013, 63). The aim of this study is to understand the relations between power and possible subjectivities and I analyse the accounts of my research participants as becoming possible in available discourses (Davies 2004), but I simultaneously seek to "legitimate the situated voices" (Gunaratnam 2004, 6). I perceive this through understanding the accounts of my interviewees

as "a starting point for understanding how power relations structure society" (Weedon 1987, 9). I study the accounts of my interviewees as becoming within current relations of power and I legitimize the situated voices by analysing how the relations of power are visible in the accounts – and also how they resist and challenge current power relations (see also Ikävalko & Kantola 2016). Although I find that all subjects depend on power for their existence and their accounts as becoming in the web of power, the accounts from marginalized positions still contain the possibility for resistance, transformation and change which I seek to give space to in my way of theorizing and writing (Hekman 1997). Still, however, I find that the accounts are unavoidably represented through my knowledge production practice.

3.3.2 Methods of inquiry in a study in three countries

Whereas "positivizing" qualitative studies aims for increasingly standardized methods, the idea of research methods has been elaborated critically in the research committed to postfoundational ontology and epistemology. However, critical considerations of methods have been less extensive than the discussions of epistemology and ontology, and unquestioned foundationalist traces remain within the conceptualizations of methods (Popoviciu 2006). The discussions about methodology and methods and their (im)possibilities in (post-)qualitative research have become prevalent in educational research (e.g. St. Pierre 2014; St. Pierre & Pillow 2000; Petersen 2018) and Elisabeth Adams St. Pierre (2014) urges us to abandon the idea of methods of inquiry and the production of "empirical data". Instead she encourages researchers to read theory until the researchers "live the theories (will not be able not to live them) and will, then, live in a different world enabled by a different ethico-onto-epistemology" which after, according to her, research can begin to become in multifaceted and even surprising ways (St. Pierre 2014, 2). Even though I find the discussions inspiring, I am still trying to find a position in which I conduct "empirical research" despite understanding it as a discursive practice and remaining sceptical of it (Petersen 2018).

The methods of this study include interviews, participant observations and policy analysis in three countries. It has been somewhat difficult to conceptualise the way I am conducting this research. When one is conducting research in several countries, it is quite automatically assumed that it must be comparative research and the units of analysis are the nation-states. One also needs to justify analysing more than one nation-state – one nation-state is typically understood as a reasonable context and one is not urged to defend analysing policies and practices within one nation state and not many. This is a sign of the methodological nationalism that is embedded in research (Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2002; see also Braidotti 2010).

The interest of my study lies in the ways the current policies and practices are constituted in and through "travelling discourses" (Lahelma 2005). Particular discourses travel through transnational governmental and non-governmental organisations, authorities and networks (Lindblad & Popkewitz 2003). Thus, ways to reason and argue around certain social objects are mobilized transnationally. The policies of nation states are impacted by transnational policies: internationalization of minority and Roma policies, Nordic co-operation in Roma policies, and shared histories are inseparable from the national Roma policies in Finland, Sweden and Norway. I find thus that we need to move beyond the national level in our analysis of policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education (see also Alexiadou 2017). One cannot separate the transnational influence from the national policies and practices. This does not mean that the local policies do not have their own trajectories. It suggests, however, that the international context is intertwined with the national – one cannot be understood without the other (Rizvi & Lingard 2009). The interest lies in "analogical incidents" (Lappalainen, Lahelma & Mietola 2015, 845–846), analysing tendencies in the discourses while remaining sensitive to differences between contexts.

But what to call my framework? The study is not *comparative education research* since my aim is not to make comparisons (see Bray, Adamson & Mason 2007). I do describe the differences and similarities between the countries to some extent, my aim not having been to construct comparisons. I rather seek to understand transnational discursive tendencies. Although in publications I and III I describe the analysis as *cross-cultural* to characterise the study in three countries, I hesitate to call my methodology cross-cultural *per se*. Cross-cultural implies an interest in the different cultural contexts where the studied phenomenon emerges (see, e.g., Mason 2007; Lappalainen, Lahelma & Mietola 2015). I find that to call my methodology cross-cultural would need a clearer analytical interest in those cultures where the policies and practices are emerging (as in Mason 2007). In the publications, I do bring the different contexts into the analysis, but my interest is not the varying cultural contexts which I find focal for *cross-cultural* analysis. I consider the labels *transnational* or *translocal* research most immediate to my methodology (see, Greiner & Sakdapolrak 2013). Transnational and translocal research methodology is often, but not exclusively, used in migration research (see, e.g., Greiner & Sakdapolrak 2013; Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2002; Faist 2012; Sager 2014). Both perspectives, transnational and translocal, stem from a critique of *methodological nationalism* (Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2002). Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002) have argued that methodological nationalism has structured social sciences, the classical social theory having neglected to analyse and include nationalism and nation-building in the grand theories, and nation states have been and are being taken for granted as analytical units. Scholars acknowledging the problem of methodological nationalism have aimed

to denationalize research objects which have traditionally been perceived as national. Saskia Sassen (2010, 3) urges scholars to recognize how placing a process such as policy formulation within a sovereign state does not signify that the process is "national". Instead, the process may be "a localization of the global". In the case of Roma and Traveller policies and practices, I find that although the processes are carried out within nation state contexts, they are localizations of the internationalization of minority rights and Roma policies. Huub van Baar (2016) calls for denationalization of methods in research about the Roma for us to analyse how their position in Europe is related to production of Europe(an-ness) and its borders.

According to Greiner & Sakdapolrak (2013, 380) the translocal approach aims to transcend the stress on nation states which is still embedded in trans*national* research. My study adopts a transnational approach since the focus is on national Roma, Traveller and basic education policies. The research is, however, translocal in that the practices, the ways of implementing the national policies, are locally developed. In the analysis, the transnational approach, however, may be characterized as dominant. Simultaneously the interest of the study in circulation of travelling discourses and their tendencies guides the study towards transcending dichotomies such as global/local and transnational/national towards simultaneous construction of national, transnational and the spaces between (see, e.g., Massey 2005; Sassen 2010).

The transnational/translocal data that I have produced consists of interviews, participant observations and policy documents. Researchers committed to the "postfoundational turn" have emphasised that empirical data is not something that waits somewhere to be gathered, data always being produced and created by the researchers. This is not to say that data is something the researcher just imagines and fabricates, but it is a commitment to the fact that the researcher produces/creates the data through choices in the research process. This emphasises the importance of detailed accounts of *how* the data was produced, what choices were made as well as reflections on whether the choices were successful (Tuori 2009, 78; Mietola 2013, 33–34). In the next section, I will elaborate my research process.

4 The research process

This research process has been an attempt to conceptualise and analyse power relations and subjectivities in Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education. The transnational and translocal analysis focuses on Finland, Sweden and Norway because they are Nordic countries in which certain Roma and Traveller groups have obtained a national minority status.

At the beginning of my PhD project I planned to interview Roma mediators and families in Finland, Sweden and Norway, but my research topic changed its shape in the course of the research process. In producing the data, I reflected on how I could avoid repeating problematic research settings where non-Roma/non-Travellers produce descriptions of Roma and Travellers. Researchers have criticised research for othering those who are the "targets" of research (e.g., Ahmed 2000; Nimako 2012). This has been a prevalent research frame in research relating to Roma and Travellers (see, e.g., Vajda 2015; Surdu 2016). During the process of my research and especially data production, I became increasingly aware of the risk of othering Roma and Travellers in my research setting. I thus turned towards the circumstances in which the promotion of education is happening as I also felt that there was a clear lack of research on the topic (see also Tuori 2009, 88–91). Thus, I started to analyse the relations of power which produce the current promotion of basic education of the Roma and Travellers.

I initially became familiarised with the questions regarding national minority Roma and education in Finland when I was working as a research assistant for the "Special Needs Class in the Course of Life" project (Niemi, Mietola & Helakorpi 2010). In that project, we interviewed, among 27 interviewees, five young adult Roma who had experiences of studying in special education. During the project, we realised the scarcity of research literature on the topic of the Roma and education in Finland – the body of literature consisted mostly of surveys conducted by government officials or NGOs. The clear need of research on the topic caught my interest. I received funding from the Finnish National Board of Education for visiting teaching assistants with a Roma background (Roma mediators) in various municipalities and staying there for a few days observing and interviewing (see Helakorpi 2013). [24] With Fritjof Sahlström, one of the supervisors of my upcoming PhD thesis, we decided that I would use this data in my PhD thesis and we planned the data production accordingly.

I started the PhD project by collecting policy documents concerning Roma, Travellers and basic education from Finland, Sweden and Norway. I already had the Finnish data from interviews and observations with Roma mediators. At this

[24] The office is now the National Agency of Education.

point, before the focus started to shift towards the policies and practices, I conducted two interviews with Finnish parents. In autumn 2015, I had the opportunity to visit Sweden for 4 months and Norway for 2 weeks through the fellowship program of the *NordForsk's Nordic Centre of Excellence: Justice through Education in the Nordic Countries* (JustEd). While I was searching for interviewees in Sweden and Norway, my focus shifted towards the policies and practices. I sought the professionals who were developing the practices. In autumn 2016, I met some of my Swedish and Norwegian interviewees again and discussed the results that I had so far. The research data from Finland, Sweden and Norway came to include a) 26 interviews, (39 hours), with people who work to promote the education of Roma and/or Travellers, b) approximately one hundred hours of observations with 5 Roma mediators in Finland and c) 8 policy documents.

Table 1. Policy documents, interviews and participant observations in Finland, Sweden and Norway

	Finland	**Sweden**	**Norway**
National policy document(s) on Roma and Travellers	The proposal of the working group for a national policy on Roma. Working group report. (MSAH 2009) Official translation	Co-ordinated long-term strategy for Roma inclusion 2012–2032 (Skr. 2011) Official translation	National minorities in Norway: About state policy on Jews, Kvens, Roma, Travellers and Forest Finns (St. Meld. 2000) Action plan for improvement of the living conditions of Roma in Oslo (AMD 2009) Official translation Assimilation and Resistance: Norwegian policies towards Tater/Romani people from 1850 to the present (a green paper) (NOU 2015) Official translation
National core curricula	National core curriculum (FNAE 2014)	Curriculum for compulsory school, preschool class and the leisure-time centre 2011 (revised 2016) (SNAE 2011)	National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training (2006): The core curriculum and subject curricula (RMERCA n.d.) Official translations

	Finland	Sweden	Norway
Research participants in interviews	7 mediators (identified as Roma)	10 workers within the field (8 identified as Roma)	7 workers/activists within the field (2 identified as Travellers, 1 identified as Roma)
Research participants for participant observations	5	-	-

Although in this research I present the dataset as including certain interviews, policy documents and observations – thus, those elements which I present in my publications (table 1) – my experiences outside the named dataset as well as the whole process of planning and producing the data have influenced the ways I ask questions and understand the policies and practices intended to promote the education of Roma and Travellers in Finland, Sweden and Norway (see Ikävalko 2016). [25] The process of assembling the data for this study has included many phases, changing plans, cancelled interviews as well as shifting focus, ethical considerations and even questioning what data is after all. In the following sections I will elaborate these dimensions of the data production starting first with general questions about the data production and then elaborating the policy data, interviews and observations.

4.1 Finding research participants and mapping the policy documents

The data production process was one of learning about the phenomenon. I had got to know the various national contexts when planning the research, but the process of producing the data gave me a more profound insight. Planning the research in three different countries, my initial thought was to produce the same type of data in each country: find related, similar level policy documents and conduct interviews with people in similar professional positions. As discussed in chapter 3.2.2, my aim has not been to compare the countries but to understand transnational and translocal discursive tendencies around the given social object: policies and practices promoting the basic education of Roma and Travellers.

As already described, my initial data was produced in Finland. The seven research participants were from five municipalities from various parts of Finland. I found the participants through the networks of the Roma education group of the

[25] Experiences such as working in the project "Special Needs Class in the Course of Life" (Niemi, Mietola & Helakorpi 2010), participating in the planning meetings of one local Roma education group, experiences from conferences and workshops, interviews with families, experiences of discussing the issues in different contexts and reading the materials provided to schools.

Finnish National Agency of Education, which has strong networks throughout Finland. Additionally, I sent inquiries to some municipalities asking whether Roma mediators worked there. I approached the possible research participants personally through e-mail. A number of the mediators I reached participated in my research, but some also declined because of their workload. We agreed with each research participant individually how they wanted to participate – whether I may observe their work or whether they might wish to participate only in interviews. Five mediators agreed to participant observations and two mediators only for an interview. Once I had talked with the mediators, I contacted the school principals and municipalities to obtain research permissions. I travelled to the municipalities and spent 16 days altogether with my research participants (1-4 days with each). When I began to conduct my PhD work I also started to look for the families to participate in my research. This led to meeting many people involved in this work in Finland. As already discussed, although in the end these did not become included in my research data (chapter 4, table 1), these encounters impacted on my understanding of promotion of basic education.

When I started to search for research participants in Sweden in 2015, I firstly focused on the Roma policies in Sweden, where the government had launched a twenty-year Roma strategy (see chapter 2.4). I got my first Swedish contact through a colleague. My initial plan was to interview the professionals who promote the education of Roma in Sweden and to observe their work as I had done in Finland. However, establishing research relationships was not as easy as in Finland and I had to abandon the idea of conducting observations in Sweden because of time and financing limitations. The interviewees worked in multiple municipalities and I travelled to meet them. In one case, I interviewed the participant via Skype. In Sweden, as in Finland, it was relatively clear who those people who carried out the policies and developed the current practices were. As in Finland, the network of people working with the issues is somewhat small and dense. I started to contact people, asking them for interviews. In addition, I found interviewees through their colleagues and acquaintances who got to know about my work.[26]

After Finland and Sweden, the Norwegian policy field felt difficult to understand. The first challenge I faced was to try to understand whether to include both Roma and Traveller national minorities in my study. The on-going conceptual confusion discussed in chapters 2.1 and 2.2 was part of my research

[26] Although I write that it is relatively clear in Finland and Sweden who implement the policies, the field becomes more complex when including NGOs. Promoting the basic education of Roma and Travellers involves a lot of different actors who do not co-ordinate their work. This resulted in some confusion and in my research diary there are notes about how I do not understand the connections between all the various actors. There are NGOs and projects that are not connected to each other or the government. However, the government's policy processes are quite clear in Finland and Sweden and it is possible to identify those who are implementing the government policies.

process. Although I made an informed decision to include both groups, which I think was right, it has caused me trouble in writing about the study. Before going to Sweden and Norway, I had not understood that using the English term "Roma" in the Norwegian context only includes *rom* and not *romanifolk/tatere* (Travellers). Thus, in Norway, "Roma" does not function as an umbrella term including Travellers as it often does in the international context and in the neighbouring Sweden. However, the historical trajectories of the emergence of these policy categories are intertwined in the Nordic countries (see chapter 2.2) and it would have been a mistake to exclude Travellers in Norway in trying to understand the travelling discourses within the Nordic countries. Before going to Norway I also asked one of my Swedish interviewees their opinion, and they thought that it would be insulting for Norwegian Travellers not to count them in this research.[27]

I found my Norwegian interviewees by first finding a few contacts, sending my interview invitation to everyone I found who was somehow related to the field and asking people to spread the word about my research topic. In the end I got quite a few contacts. What I firstly paid attention to in Norway however was that the people employed to work with the topic of Roma, Travellers and education did not identify as Roma or Travellers themselves as in Finland and Sweden. There were people from NGOs or activists who identified as Roma or Travellers wanting to influence the current situation but they were not hired full time by the municipalities or government as in Finland and Sweden. I was not prepared for this: going to Norway after Finland and Sweden I automatically assumed that the people I would meet would mostly identify as Roma or Travellers. What also caught my eye was how fragmented the work was in Norway – it was not as clear as it was in Finland and Sweden. In the end, my interviewees included people at various administrative levels, in NGOs, or activists who were working with these issues. I also had informal discussions with people within the field but who did not want to be interviewed. The fragmentariness of the work became apparent in Norway and I had a hard time understanding how these diverse actors were connected to each other.

Trying to find the policy documents which would somehow represent the same level of policies from the different countries was difficult. I started to map and read the policy documents before I conducted my interviews in Sweden and Norway. However, I also asked my interviewees what policy documents they consider the key documents and whether they thought I was on the right track. I first mapped the key policy documents on national minority Roma and Traveller groups country by country. Similarly, with the educational policy documents, I started by mapping the legislation and national policy documents that direct basic

[27] This is, however, a very complex issue since Norwegian Travellers have multiple viewpoints about their minority status or relationship to transnational Roma-ness (see, e.g., Publication I; Lund & Moen 2013).

education, focusing on sections discussing national minorities or, more specifically, Roma and Traveller groups. I narrowed down the data to include only central national documents that directed local practices and policies. By this means, such documents as materials produced in various development projects focusing on Roma, Travellers and schooling were excluded. I also mapped the materials that were produced for schools about Roma and Travellers in these countries, including materials such as *Romanilapsen kohtaaminen esi- ja perusopetuksessa* (FNAE 2010), *Romanit.fi – oppimateriaalia yläkouluille* (romanit.fi), *Skolverket: Stödpaket för att undervisa om romer* (SNAE: Stödpaket f.d.), *Vi läser om romer* (RUF 2013), *Antiziganismen i Sverige: Om övergreppen och kränkningar av romer under 1900-tale och i dag* (Kommissionen mot Antiziganism 2015b) and *Våre nasjonale minoriteter* (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2014). I read and analysed these materials both for publications I and III, but in the end I had to exclude them from the data since there was no space to elaborate them in the publications.

Through this process I found out how Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian work was organised and how the actors discussed the current situation. Since some time has already passed since the data production and analysis, especially from the Finnish interviews, some changes have occurred in the policy processes. For instance, the new Finnish Roma strategy, *Finland's National Roma Policy (ROMPO) 2018 – 2022* (MSAH 2018), was published in May 2018. However, the measures proposed in basic education resemble those in the first national strategy and drastic changes have not eventuated. As described in chapter 2.4, the implementation of the Swedish strategy, *En samordnad och långsiktig strategi för romsk inkludering 2012–2032* (Skr. 2011), started in five pilot municipalities which received funding from the government. After the first five pilot municipalities, five new municipalities have become "development municipalities" and received funding (Länsstyrelsen Stockholm 2018). The County Administrative Board of Stockholm coordinates and monitors the implementation of the strategy and filed its fifth annual report to the government in 2018 (Länsstyrelsen Stockholm 2018). The County Administrative Board of Stockholm, the National Agency of Education as well as municipalities are continually developing practices to implement the strategy (see further chapter 2.5). No drastic changes in the policy work have taken place however. In Norway, the Department of Roma Measures was closed down. The "Romlostjensten" is still under development and a group of "Romlos" who are non-Roma and mediator/assistants who are Roma are now working to improve the basic education of Roma children in Oslo (Hagatun 2019a). The green paper about Travellers has not led to a Traveller policy. Norway is, however, preparing a new white paper about national minorities and the green paper about Travellers may provide background for the new white paper. These most recent occurrences in

the policy processes are not scrutinized in this study but it is noteworthy that the policies are subject to constant change.

4.2 Policy documents as data

Wendy Brown (1998, 41) has described our societies as "saturated" with policy. Today, policies are central in regulating relations within and between/beyond societies (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016, 7). Policies as part of constituting social relations have become naturalized: it is even difficult to imagine societies without policies (cf. Bacchi & Goodwin 2016). Public policies are normative, reflecting the societal goals and desired change (cf. Weimer & Vining 2014) and typically new reforms within institutions are introduced through policies (Rizvi & Lingard 2009). According to Rizvi & Lingard (2009, 8–9), policies are produced to establish consistency and to form consent in the ways authorised norms and values are carried out and applied in different contexts. Policies are often binding to some extent. Sometimes they are, however, mostly symbolic whereas at others they are closely tied to the distribution of resources (Rizvi & Lingard 2009). However, what actually happens in those contexts which the policies aim to regulate is no way straightforward. The policies are "'contested', mediated and differently represented by different actors in different contexts" (Ball 2015, 311). Sara Ahmed (2006; 2012; 2017) has pointed out that policies on antiracism and diversity work are often *non-performative*. This means for instance that institutions may commit to "antiracism" in policy texts, but "they do not bring into effect that which they name" (Ahmed 2012, 119).

In publication I, together with my co-authors, I analyse policy documents and we concentrate on those documents produced by the governments, i.e., on *public policies* (Rizvi & Lingard 2009, 4). Thus in publication I, the focus is on certain policy texts and we exclude from the analysis other aspects of policies, such as agenda-setting, the process of writing the policy documents, implementation and evaluation (cf. Rizvi & Lingard 2009, 5). The initial idea for the policy analysis was to find out how basic education is discussed in the Roma and Traveller policies and how Roma and Travellers are discussed in basic education policies. At this point, we also wanted to include the guide books about Roma and Travellers which were produced for the schools by governments (see the beginning of this chapter). I started by mapping the legislation in each country and finding out how the minority issues and basic education were governed. Thus, at this point the conceptualization of policy documents was broad, ranging from legislation and municipal strategies to guide books and even NGO projects (cf. Rizvi & Lingard 2009, 4; Bacchi & Goodwin 2016, 17–18). After reading many types of policy documents and project reports, we narrowed down the data to those which can be characterized as steering policy documents. As I have described at the beginning of this chapter (table 1), the data from Finland includes *The*

Proposal of the Working Group for a National Policy on Roma (MSAH 2009) which was the Finnish national steering Roma policy until spring 2018 when *Finland's National Roma Policy (ROMPO) 2018 – 2022* (MSAH 2018) was introduced. From Sweden we included a similar kind of national steering document *The coordinated long-term strategy for Roma inclusion 2012–2032* (Skr. 2011). Both the Finnish and Swedish documents serve as national Roma integration strategies (NRIS) for the European Union (see also chapter 2.4). Whereas it was quite clear which policy documents to include from Finland and Sweden, choosing the Norwegian ones was difficult. We ended up including three Norwegian policy documents, each of them different in nature: 1) the white paper on national minorities entitled *National minorities in Norway: about state policy on Jews, Kvens, Roma, Travellers and Forest Finns* (St. Meld 2000), 2) *Action plan for improvement of the living conditions of Roma in Oslo* (AID 2009), and 3) the green paper on Traveller policy entitled *Assimilation and Resistance: Norwegian policies towards Tater/Romani people from 1850 to the present* (NOU 2015). Whereas in Sweden we left out the general policy (which Finland does not have) about national/old minorities, in Norway we had to include the white paper on national minorities since it is also the national steering document on Roma and Travellers. In Finland and Sweden we also had to exclude municipal level policies of which there are many. However, in Norway we had to include the local *Action plan for improvement of the living conditions of Roma in Oslo* (AID 2009), since it is the only policy on Roma in Norway (it is estimated that most of the Norwegian Roma live in the Oslo area). In addition, in Finland and Sweden we excluded green papers from the data since we wanted to analyse the policy measures. However, in Norway we needed to include the green paper on Traveller policy entitled *Assimilation and Resistance: Norwegian policies towards Tater/Romani people from 1850 to the present* (NOU 2015) since it was the only one discussing a possible national policy on Travellers. In the analysis, we acknowledged the fact that the policy documents were different in nature.

On basic education, we decided to include the national core curricula which are the governing documents. Defining the data set on basic education was thus clearer and we included the national curricula from each country: the Finnish National core curriculum 2014 (FNAE 2014), the Swedish Curriculum for compulsory school, preschool classes and the leisure-time centres of 2011 (revised 2016) (SNAE 2011) and the Norwegian National curriculum for knowledge promotion, which applies to primary and secondary education (RMERCA n.d.).[28]

[28] Finland has a national core curriculum and a core curriculum for adults in basic education. Sweden has four other curricula in basic education in addition to that included in our data. These focus on learning disabilities, special schools, Sami schools, and adult education. Norway also has a Sami national curriculum for knowledge promotion. In relation to Roma and Traveller minorities, these curricula do not differ greatly from the curricula chosen for the data. We have analysed the core curriculum and subject curricula

The Swedish curriculum has been revised since the time of analysis, but the revisions have not impacted the sections specifically discussing the Roma or national minorities. In Norway a new core curriculum is being drafted and is going to be implemented in 2020 (udir.no).

In this study, I see policy documents from the poststructural perspective as productions of power and as shaping and producing subjectivities and relations within nation-states (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016; Bacchi 2009; 2000). Thus, I see the policy documents from a discursive perspective. Stephen J. Ball (1993; 2015) makes an analytical distinction between *policy as text* and *policy as discourse*. From the perspective of policy as text, it is noted that policy texts are typically co-authored, the authoring process including negotiations and concessions from each author (Ball 1993, 11). This is also the case with the texts of policies on Roma and Travellers and curricula which are analysed in this study. Each policy text has found its shape as text through negotiations and compromises. The processes have included, for instance, multiple working groups as well as hearings with interest groups (on the Swedish Roma strategy, see Alexiadou & Nordberg 2017). In this research, however, I have approached policies as "policy as discourse", the other perspective distinguished by Stephen J. Ball. The aim has been to understand what kind of representations of the societal problems the policy documents contain (e.g., Bacchi & Goodwin 2016). The interest lies in the ways the production of the "issue" also constitutes categories and, in this case, shapes and produces ethnic/racial relations (Bacchi 2000, 50; Bacchi 2010, 69). Attention is also turned towards the ways societal change is framed (Bacchi 1999, 180). From this poststructural perspective, policies as discourses enable and constrain the process(es) of subject constitution, i.e., subjectification (Bacchi 2010; see chapter 3.2.1). As policies become constituted within discourses, policies also mobilise and strengthen discourses serving us opportunities to make sense of ourselves, the institutions and phenomena at hand (Ball 2015, 307).

4.3 Interviews and observations with professionals

When I describe my research in academic contexts, I often get asked whether it was hard for me to obtain participants for my research or to have discussions with them. I am told that Roma and Travellers are very hard to reach for research or hard to get to "open up". In one blind review comment for an article I was told that "(t)he methods are unclear and more detail is needed here, for example, how was access obtained? Were there any problems with this? Were gatekeepers used? Were there any ethical issues that arose from the study; if so, how were these addressed? These are vital questions in research with/on Roma." I interpret that underlying these questions is an assumption that the race/ethnicity of the

of the Norwegian curriculum for knowledge promotion, leaving out the quality framework, distribution of teaching hours per subject, and individual assessment.

researcher and the research participant is the one difference which organises all the interaction with the research participants (Gunaratnam 2003, 80). If all of my interviewees had been white teaching assistants and other education and policy professionals, few would assume that our ethnicities were what defined the whole research interaction (cf. Gunaratnam 2003, 85). I also claim that in these questions we can observe how what Sara Ahmed (2000) calls the figure of the "stranger", who we think we "know" before any encounter, impacts how the research practice becomes perceived. Thus, when hearing that most of the research participants identify as Roma or Traveller, people already "know" how "the Roma" will be in a research setting.

As I have mentioned, I wanted to interview people who were the professionals implementing the current policies. In Finland and Sweden, I contacted my participants through their work e-mail or work phone. Most said yes to my interview request and most were Roma themselves (7/7 in Finland, 8/10 in Sweden). Some declined because of their workload. In Norway, however, I circulated the interview call through networks and people contacted me. Most of my Norwegian interviewees did not identify as Roma or Traveller themselves since at that time those people holding paid positions were not Roma or Travellers. But I did reach some activists and NGO representatives who were Roma (1) or Travellers (2). The short time I had in Norway limited my search for participants. All in all, there was no mystery in my search for the research participants or obtaining access. It was just "business as usual" in terms of finding interviewees for research. As already described, the permissions for making observations in schools were obtained from the municipalities and schools. The research participants' participation in research and the ethical questions such as anonymity were discussed and agreed with the participant.

4.3.1 Interviews with professionals

The research participants held exceptional positions, knowledge and understanding about how the basic education of Roma and Travellers was promoted in their countries.[29] In Finland, the research participants were teaching assistants with Roma backgrounds in schools. One of the interviewees no longer worked as a teaching assistant but still worked with the promotion of basic education of Finnish Roma. They are the Finnish equivalent of Roma mediators in schools (publication II; see also Helakorpi 2013). Roma mediators are a European policy measure proposed to promote the equality of Roma in institutions (see, e.g., Kuychukov 2012; Rus & Zatreanu 2006). The work of Roma mediators is at the heart of the Finnish and Swedish policy implementation in the school context. Four of my Swedish interviewees also worked as Roma mediators

[29] Because my interviewees are easily identifiable, I will not present their work in great detail – especially not in Sweden and Norway.

(*brobyggare*) in schools. The remaining Swedish interviewees worked at the strategic level with the implementation of the Swedish Roma policy. The strategic level means their work in planning the implementation of the national Roma policy in their localities. Their responsibilities extended from basic education to employment, social services and health care, among other things. The Norwegian interviewees were positioned in a variety of ways within the field. As mentioned, one of my interviewees was a Roma activist. Two worked for the government, two for an NGO and two worked for a municipality.

I understand my interview data as consisting of interviews with professionals. The research participants were involved in developing the ways the current policies could be and were implemented. As described in chapter 2.5, this field is undergoing constant change and the practices are developing as we speak. Some of my interviewees had been part of the same work before current national policies were written and thus some also had a unique historical perspective.

I was interested in the work of my interviewees and how they made sense of their work. I wanted to hear their professional talk and understand the professional discourses. I categorise the interviews in two types according to the way they were conducted: 1. thematic interviews in which the interviewee and I met once and discussed themes related to their work (most of the interviews) and 2. ethnographic interviews which included observations and a longer time together (five in Finland) (Heyl 2001; Mietola 2007). Before conducting the interviews I had learned as much as I could about the contexts. Occasionally, the research participants sent me something to read before the interviews. Although I prepared well for the interviews, there was a whole lot of issues I did not comprehend before I met my interviewees. In Norway especially, I felt I could not get a good grasp of the field without talking to my interviewees and other professionals.

I had interview guides in the interviews (appendix 2, interview guides). The themes that we covered in all interviews included the interviewee's work in practice; the interviewee's perceptions of the current situation, current measures and practices; the interviewee's perceptions of the situation in the country and the interviewee's own path to that work. In the interviews, I did not inquire whether the interviewees identified as Roma or Traveller, but each interviewee brought up their own ethnic identification during the interview. The thematic interviews typically lasted from one to two hours, in one case just half an hour and in some cases even three hours. If it was possible and there was some material to be found, I read beforehand the local policy documents which handled the interviewee's work and about the organisation/administration the interviewee was working in. I could then ask for comments or clarifications in the interviews. In Finland, I conducted the interviews in Finnish, in Sweden most of them in Swedish (one in English) and in Norway in English and a mix of Swedish and Norwegian. Although my own Swedish language skills were far from perfect, my aim in using Swedish in Sweden was to hear how my interviewees talk about their work in the

language they work with. Since I do not speak Norwegian, in Norway the interviewees had to speak in a language other than their working language.

In Sweden and Norway, I met my interviewees a year later and I sent them drafts of two of my articles (publications I and II). We discussed my results and also what had happened during the past year. I did not reach all of my participants for the new meeting, which was not an interview but a way to catch up and discuss my initial results. I have not included these meetings in my data, but they have contributed to my understanding of the phenomenon as discussed at the beginning of this chapter (4.).

The fact that I interviewed the participants as professionals does not mean that the power imbalance between the researcher and the research participant would become deconstructed. In the end, the participants have had little space to impact on the research practices and the way the research object at hand is represented in the publications (see chapter 4.5.2). Furthermore, approaching my interviewees as professionals does not erase the structural power relations such as my white privilege or privileges provided by my academic position in the research setting. In the interview setting, we become speaking subjects through the circulating discourses and webs of power that are present also in the interview situation. Our different positions and situated knowledge have inevitably had an impact on the research relationship and for instance what the interviewees disclose with me. (see chapter 4.3.3 about emergence of interview talk). This notion has also guided the way I have analysed the discourses and power relations in the interview data (see chapter 4.4.2)

4.3.2 Ethnographic interviews in Finland

The Finnish data is different from the rest since I observed the work of most of my Finnish participants. The participant observations took place during autumn 2012. I followed my interviewees during their work days writing down what I saw and talking with my interviewees, who were very active in finding ways for me to follow their work and in making space for me in the schools. Thus, I did not need to feel awkward about where to place myself during classes or meetings since my interviewees always took care that I had a place. I made hand-written notes but I also carried a recorder which I tried to put on as often as I could when I talked alone with my interviewees. Two of my interviewees worked in multiple localities and during the days we drove to different schools to such things as meetings and consultations. The other three worked in one school: they worked with all of the children in the school, and their work was scheduled according to the children's school day. Many of my Finnish interviewees worked after official working hours (e.g. consulting with families) but I did not follow these situations. In addition to discussions during the work day, we also had separate interviews in which we followed my interview guide (see appendix 2). I have called the interviews and

discussions with my participants ethnographic interviews (Heyl 2001). I asked them about occurrences and episodes I had witnessed or we had experienced together. The participants were asked about the events of the day and their work in general. The same things were discussed many times and this also facilitated hearing different forms of their sense making with different nuances. We also became more familiar with each other since we spent several intense days together (for research relations see chapter 4.3.4). There were 14 hours of recorded discussions and interviews and 150 notebook pages of hand-written notes.

4.3.3 Interview talk in the context of work and profession

Since I invited my interviewees to discuss their work as professionals, this has resulted in a particular type of *interview talk* (Mietola 2007). In using the concept of "interview talk", I want to emphasise that the speech in the interviews is constituted in the interview interaction and it is different "talk" from having an exchange for instance with a friend or a colleague. Interview talk is constituted by being aware of the interview situation and in interaction with the interviewer (Oinas 2004; Mietola 2007; Ruusuvuori & Tiittula 2005). "The interview talk" as a form of discussion possess a particular significance and importance (Mietola 2007). From the perspective of the poststructural framework I see the interview situation as becoming in discourses, in the webs of power/knowledge. Thus, possible ways of thinking and acting are constituted by discourses and the process of subject constitution is ongoing in the interview situation (cf. Bacchi & Bonham 2016). Furthermore, as the interviewees talk they simultaneously make sense of the interview as an evolving situation – thus their talk is related to the interview as a practice understood in a certain way (Popoviciu et al. 2006; Mietola 2007). Laura Huttunen and Riikka Homanen (2017) suggests that it opens up possibilities of interpretations of interview data when asking who the interviewee is talking to when talking to a researcher. Thus the meanings ascribed to the interview are in play in the constitution of interview talk (see also Popoviciu et al. 2006).

Elina Oinas (2001, 60) suggests that the nature of interviews as unique social encounters means that the analysis of interviews may focus on "situated accounts and context"; the accounts in the interviews are constituted in particular contexts, and the contexts generate particular kinds of accounts. The analysis may include the question of what kinds of accounts are possible in certain contexts. As Reetta Mietola (2007, 158) has put it, the question becomes: "what do the interview narrations disclose?" ("*Mistä kerronta kertoo*"). In connection to Oinas' and Mietola's arguments and drawing from Bronwyn Davies, the interest of my analysis is what kind of sense-making the interviewees carry out within available discourses (Davies 2004). [30] Bacchi & Bonham (2016, 115) suggest that

[30] My use of verbs such as "making sense", "negotiating" or "navigating" in an analysis of interviews can be seen as evoking the prediscursive subject which in the poststructural

poststructural task for analysing interview data is to focus on "the kinds of 'subjects' it is possible to become" which is at the heart of the research objective of this study (see chapter 3.1).

The primary context in which the accounts of my interviewees emerge, is work and profession (although there are always multiple contexts and discourses present). I analyse the interview talk as accounts generated by the work context of the interviewees. As Svend Brinkmann (2018, 595) describes it, the way research participants are addressed in the research practices takes part in the constitution of the subject. This notion suggests that the analysis may focus on the context of the interview talk as Oinas has also argued above. I addressed my interviewees as professionals in the context of their work which I understand as taking part in their subject constitution in the interviews: when arranging and agreeing upon the interview, I expressed my interest in the interviewees' work. Except for three interviews, the interviews were conducted at the research participants' workplace: during their working hours, at their workplace meeting rooms or their offices. [31] Every so often, my interviewee introduced me to their co-workers and occasionally my interviewees had to complete an urgent work task, like take a phone call, in the middle of the interview. Usually my interviewee offered me coffee and once we ate lunch at the interviewee's work place's lunch café. As described in section 4.3.2, I conducted participant observations at the workplace of five of the Finnish interviewees, all the discussions taking place physically in the work context. Thus, this context was apparent in the actual surroundings in most of the interview situations. The work context was also visible in the ways my interviewees encountered the research situation. The discussions became eminently matter-of-fact discussions and not therapeutic, for instance (see Duncombe & Jessop 2012).

Most of the interviewees were quite prepared in how to discuss their work, the work processes and how the work could be developed. I had expressed my interest in their work and they were prepared to present and conceptualise what they were carrying out in their work, what kinds of problem and outcomes they had identified, and how their work unit had performed. Some of my interviewees had clearly political aims and aspirations to bring about change. For instance, one interviewee would have wished me to give them a platform to speak in their own

framework of this study is problematized (see chapter 3.2.1) (Jones 1997; Bacchi & Bonham 2016). This is not, however, my intention. As Bronwyn Davies (1997) has described, I also find myself caught within the language where the subject as in a constant process of becoming is difficult to write about. Furthermore, my analytic aim is to concentrate on the process of subject constitution and I find that to conceptualise how the discourses function, the description of the subject making sense of the world and themselves in available discourses is needed (see chapter 3.2.1).

[31] Two of the Swedish interviews took place in a café. The second interviewee thought that it would be easier for me if we met at a café to which I had direct public transportation. The other one expressed a wish to talk without anyone at the workplace hearing us. The Norwegian activist I met at their home (and continued the interview later by phone).

name. They were disappointed when I said that the interviews would be anonymized and expressed how important they felt it was that Roma be heard and seen in the work related to Roma issues (see also chapter 4.5 about research ethics). One interviewee explicitly expressed the wish to tell their side of their work, saying that they sometimes felt that their colleagues did not really appreciate the interviewee's ideas or perceptions. The interviewee thus had a clear wish to tell their side of the story in the interview. I will come back to the analysis in chapter 4.4.2.

4.3.4 Research interest shaping research relationships

As described, the interest in my interviews and observations was the work and expertise of my interviewees, which is why I characterize my interviews as interviews of professionals. Thus, the focus of the research is not the person I am interviewing but their professional speech, their work and those discourses/discursive practices that constitute the work and the becoming of a professional (see chapter 3.2.1). Bacchi & Bonham (2016, 115) call this "a form of politicization of 'personhood'". The people are not of interest themselves, as the focus is on "things said" (Bacchi & Bonham 2016).

The research interest in the circulating discourses and the ways the issue of the Roma, Travellers and basic education is discussed at a professional level has led to a certain distance in the research relationships. The research interest did not demand data which goes "deep" into my interviewees' lives. Instead, it was important to hear their everyday talk about their profession (also Helakorpi, Mietola & Niemi 2014). One reason for such a research setting is ethical considerations. The so-called Romani studies have a long tradition of ethnographies and other research settings where a white researcher enters a Roma community and starts to "produce knowledge about the Roma". I wanted to distance this research from such a setting and instead of studying "Roma and Travellers" and producing knowledge "about them", the interest is the power relations which structure and produce the current policies and practices (cf. Araujo 2014). Salla Tuori (2007, 88–91) describes how she struggled with the same kind of ethical questions in her research setting, ending up calling her method the "ethnography of distance"; maintaining a distance from the research practices of producing knowledge "about the Other" (see also Ahmed 2000).

The nature of research relationships has provoked lively discussions in feminist literature (see, e.g., Oinas 2004; Oakley 1981; 2016; Duncombe & Jessop 2012). Should interviews aim for intimacy and in what kind of data would intimacy result? What if the research relations are distant? (see Oinas 2004). As disclosed, my aim was not to create close relationships with my interviewees. The research participants and I kept a degree of distance which I did not seek to encroach on. We met as professionals. With my Finnish interviewees, we spent

intense days together when we occasionally ended up discussing personal matters as well. However, I/we kept boundaries and only spent time in the school setting and not in the free-time (although they also worked somewhat unofficially in their free-time). Even though I have remarked on how I would like to become friends with my interviewees, especially in my notes from Finland, my aim was to be clear that my interviewees were talking to a researcher – not a friend or a colleague. Apart from building a distinction from "research about the Other", I find the withdrawn research relation an ethical and a clear stance in preventing the interviewees from revealing and disclosing issues they would not want to become part of a research project. I do not argue that close relationships in research are unethical, but I do claim that they may lead to specific ethical questions about the research participant's well-being and informed consent. Elina Oinas (2001, 56) has indicated how mimicking friendship in the research relation may empower some informants, but it may also lead to feelings of betrayal since the impression of friendship is research. Interviewees may disclose topics which they afterwards feel ashamed of (see also chapter 4.5 on research ethics).

4.4 Analysis and writing

As we saw, my epistemological understanding draws from literature committed to the "postfoundational turn" (e.g., Lather 2007; see chapter 3.2), I understand research as a (set of) discursive practice(s) (Gunaratnam 2003) and the knowledge research produces I perceive as situated and partial (see chapter 3.2.1). In this section, I describe how I have perceived and conducted my analysis and writing. Amanda Coffey and Paul Atkinson (1996, 108) state that the core of analysis is "representation or reconstruction of social phenomena". Analysis takes place throughout the research process. The literature one has engaged with and is reading directs the whole research process and the researcher conducts constant analysis of the phenomenon while carrying out any part of the research (Coffey & Atkinson 1996). How the reports of the research, e.g., the articles, book chapters, summaries, conference papers or lectures, become, are creative processes where one seeks to think with data, literature and theories and represent the phenomena (often) in words (Coffey & Atkinson 1996; Richardson & St. Pierre 2005; Jackson & Mazzei 2012). In this study, publications I and II were co-authored by my supervisors Sirpa Lappalainen and Reetta Mietola (publication I) and Sirpa Lappalainen and Fritjof Sahlström (publication II) and our discussions influenced the process of analysis (analysis through discussion, see Lappalainen, Lahelma & Mietola 2015).

Many qualitative researchers emphasise the creativeness of analysis (e.g., Coffey & Atkinson 1996; Jackson & Mazzei 2012) and I have found that analysis and writing were not technical processes such as coding the data, but have become a process of reading data and literature side by side over and over again.

Furthermore, writing itself has become the process of composing the analysis, testing the ideas, understanding theory and data, and creating "representations of [the] social phenomena" studied. Thus, I could call writing one of my "methods of inquiry" (Richardson & St. Pierre 2005). One could author manifold of representations using my data. In this section, I describe how my analysis came about and what it meant for me to analyse by drawing from poststructuralism, feminism, and critical theories of race and whiteness.

As my research objectives are to ask what kind of power relations and subjectivities are constituted, this has demanded "reading strategies" (Tuori 2009, 96) which enable me to analyse, understand, and represent these from my data. Drawing from certain lines of poststructural thinking (see chapter 3.2), I describe my reading as discursive (see, e.g., Ikävalko 2016). This means that in my analysis I perceive policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and education as constituted within discourses. I am interested in the relations between history, social surroundings and institutions (see also Bové 1990) around the current policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education and I am interested in understanding how certain statements become "sayable" in current conditions (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016, 116; Foucault 1991). Thus I am not focusing solely on what is said (or written) but how what is said (or written) has become "sayable" and what those statements produce.

4.4.1 Policy analysis

To analyse policy documents, I have drawn from Carol Bacchi's What's the Problem Represented to Be approach (WPR) (Bacchi 2000; 2009; Bachhi & Goodwin 2016). As described in section 4.2, I have adopted the policy-as-discourse perspective on policy documents. In Foucault-inspired WPR analysis, the core question is what are constituted as problems by the policy. With the WPR approach, one aims to scrutinise the assumptions which the problem representations are built on (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016). Policies are understood as constituting problematizations and simultaneously being based on implicit problematizations. Problematization and problem representations are constituted within discourses (Bacchi 2010). Foucault characterises problematization as "the totality of discursive or non-discursive practices that introduces something into the play of true and false and constitutes it as an object for thought" (Foucault 1988, 257). Thus, problematizations shape what phenomena can be thought of. The multitude of solutions derive from problematizations which have rendered the solutions intelligible (Foucault 1997b). The framing of problems effects what action can be taken, what is focused on, what kind of feelings objects of thought evoke, and how people may make sense of themselves and others (Bacchi 2000, 50; Bacchi 2010, 64).

For Bacchi (2009) the concept of problem representation in policy analysis refers to an analysis of problematizations in specific policy contexts. Drawing from Michel Foucault, Carol Bacchi understands policy texts as embarking on practices which rely on a particular problematization (Bacchi 2012, 4). The interest of the analysis lies in how the problematizations have come about and what their effects are. The problem representations are always constituted within wider societal discourses and thus one needs to address the way in which the representation of the problem was initially created. Furthermore, what is left without discussing and problematizing by the policies is scrutinised which initiates ways to ask whether and how the problems could be thought over otherwise (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016).

The process with publication I, article "Equality in the making? Policies on Roma, Travellers and basic education in three countries" (Helakorpi, Lappalainen & Mietola 2018) began by setting out to map what was perceived as problems in basic education when considering Roma and Traveller national minorities. I sought to understand the discursive landscape of the Roma, Travellers and basic education – the object of thought. Having chosen the policy documents (see chapter 4.2), I began the process of analysis by reading the texts thoroughly. I brought my initial thoughts up in discussions with my co-authors, Sirpa Lappalainen and Reetta Mietola. At this point we noticed a discrepancy in how the Roma and Traveller documents were promoting human rights and equality in the general descriptions but the actual measures seemed to focus on something else. We considered that drawing from Carol Bacchi's WPR-approach enabled an analysis of those problematizations which produce the current policy measures (cf. Foucault 1984). The WPR approach suggests that we should "identify a 'proposal' or a 'proposed solution'" to determine what kind of problem representation it corresponds to (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016, 19). This led us to specify the measures about basic education from the policy documents on Roma and Travellers, after which we determined the kind of problem representation(s) to which each measure responds. We listed the sections in the national curricula which cover either Roma or Traveller minorities particularly or national minorities in general. The topics in relation to which the groups were discussed were organized thematically. Through this process, we gave shape to the problem representations to which these specific policies respond. This analysis allowed a conceptualization of the current discursive terrain around the topic of Roma, Travellers and basic education.

4.4.2 Analysing the interviews

With the interview data, my reading strategy has likewise been discursive. As described in section 4.3, the aim of the analysis is not to concentrate on the interviewee as a person, but to analyse the sense-making enabled by the discourses

for the subject in the process of becoming (Davies 2004, 4). The aim is to comprehend the backdrop for possible subject constitution (cf. Bacchi & Bonvin 2016, 115). The research participants are professionals in the field and the discourses which constitute the field enable and constrain their subjectification. How one constructs meaning and expresses experiences depends on attainable present discourses which are various and contradictory (see chapter 4.3.3; Richardson & St. Pierre 2005; Brinkman 2018). Thus, one discusses in multiple discourses which makes the interview talk contradictory. Analysis of the sense-making of my interviewees presents opportunities to understand the discourses in which their work is constituted (Davies 2004).

Publication II, "Becoming tolerable: subject constitution of Roma mediators in Finnish schools" (Helakorpi, Lappalainen & Sahlström 2019) evolved from an interest in the meanings attributed to "Roma-ness" by the Finnish Roma mediators. This article was the first one I began to write for the PhD and at that point I only had the Finnish data, so that the timing of writing limited this article to the Finnish context. Publication III "Knowledge about Roma and Travellers in Nordic schools: paradoxes, constraints and possibilities" (Helakorpi in press) began with an interest in the question of "providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers". In both cases, the initial interest emerged from Roma and Traveller policies. The "Roma-ness" of Roma mediators is central to their work (see, e.g., Rus & Zatreanu 2006; Kuychukov 2012). It seemed significant to understand how the research participants made sense of their Roma-ness in their work. The notion of a "need for knowledge about Roma and Travellers" was a discourse which connected each of the policy documents in publication I, although the remarks were ambiguous.

In publication III, I sought to scrutinize how my interviewees made sense of this practice which they were implementing and developing in their work. I began the analysis with all the interviews as well as the materials about Roma and Travellers provided to schools. During the process of analysis, I realized that if I included all the interviews, I would be required to analyse the differing positions of the professionals who identify and do not identify as Roma or Traveller themselves. I found that their positions related to knowledge about Roma and Travellers differed from each other distinctively. For instance, the majority of Roma and Traveller interviewees reported how their own personality and experiences, their embodied Roma-ness or Traveller-ness, participate in providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers. The limited space of the book chapter meant that I had to exclude interviews which were conducted with individuals not identifying as Roma or Travellers. The book chapter did not offer space for elaborating different positions. The book chapter came to focus on how those discourses function in the work of professionals identifying as Roma or Travellers themselves. In its current form, the book chapter does not include analysis of how my interviewees position themselves in relation to the "knowledge about Roma

and Travellers" although the interviewees identifying themselves as Roma or Travellers certainly have differing positions. Thus, I do not claim that Roma-ness and Traveller-ness shape only one type of position in relation to knowledge about Roma and Travellers, but I do argue that a distinct difference is established between non-Roma/non-Travellers and Roma and Travellers when the claim of knowledge is either about "them" or about "us". However, as mentioned, this is not elaborated in the text.

I analysed and conceptualised the phenomenon through intensive reading and writing processes during which I read the data together with theories and previous literature (Coffey & Atkinson 1996; Jackson & Mazzei 2012; Koski 2011). For the publication II, I combed the data, read literature and drafted ways to conceptualise and organize the observations thematically, which we then discussed together with my co-authors, Sirpa Lappalainen and Fritjof Sahlström. I identify three phases in the process of analysing the interview data for publications II and III: 1.) scrutinizing the data with one focal question; 2.) organizing thematically those interview excerpts dealing with the focal question; 3.) choosing examples to conceptualise and represent the data. The three phases fluctuated in the process of analysis and writing. I formulated the focal question ("Roma-ness" and "Knowledge about the Roma and Travellers") through the process of data production, getting familiarised with the policy documents and reading theory and previous literature. With the focal question, I read the data through and gathered all relevant excerpts. Thereafter I reread and listened to all the excerpts and organized them thematically. In the third phase, I chose excerpts which I found captured the themes and began to conceptualise the excerpts with the help of theories and previous research. Through these three phases, and repeating them, the analytical representations of the object of the study found their verbal shape.

4.5 Ethical questions

4.5.1 Ethical questions in data production

The integrity and well-being of the research participants is paramount. Research practices, should ensure the integrity of the research participants, which includes informed consent and the voluntariness of the research participants. Furthermore, the researcher needs to see that the research practices will not harm the research participants. The researcher also needs to ensure the privacy of the research participants and the proper data protection (TENK 2009).

I either contacted the interviewees personally or they contacted me having become aware of my research through networks, typically by e-mail or phone. I introduced myself and the nature of the study. I specified in the first contact that the interviews would be anonymized. In Finland, where I would observe the work

of most of my interviewees, I obtained research permits from the municipalities and school principals. I applied for permissions to observe the work of my interviewees while guaranteeing that I would not observe the pupils. One school required me to send a short information sheet to pupils' guardians but other than that, pupils and their guardians were not included in the process of attaining research permits. Although I was only interested in the work of my interviewees, in practice, it was impossible to exclude the pupils completely since the interviewees interacted with them. I solved this by not disclosing anything in the notes which would somehow identify the pupils. Thus, if I made remarks about an interaction with a pupil or pupils, I did not attach any attributes to the pupil and I concentrated in the notes on what the interviewee did. The pupils were informed in each situation about my research and they could ask me about the study. I emphasized, however, that I was not there to observe them. In addition, the interviewees were conscientious in not disclosing anything revealing or identifying about the pupils or families they worked with.

Once my research participants had agreed to take part, we met (with one interviewee on Skype). Before we started the interview/observations and started the recording and taking notes, I talked through the following: the participant does not need to answer anything they do not want to, the participant may call off the interview at any point they wish and the interviewee may ask me not to use certain discussions or episodes. The interviewee may also contact me afterwards and withdraw their participation before I publish my results or they may ask me to exclude parts of their interviews (or observations). We signed a research contract (appendix 1) in which I commit to ethical data management and anonymizing.

4.5.2 Ethical questions in analysis and writing

In a theoretical perspective stemming from poststructuralism, feminism and critical theories on race and whiteness, the ways of writing and representing are ethically significant (e.g., Richardson & St. Pierre 2005). I have worked to be critical about *how* I write. To write outside discourses and thus relations of power is not possible. Research is a discursive practice. However, one may examine one's own writing and performing critically. This may be characterized as *reflexivity*. Yasmin Gunaratnam (2003, 6) argues for "radical reflexivity" in research. Gunaratnam claims that the researcher should scrutinize the situated-ness of the researcher and the research participant and position the research and its knowledge production in the historical and social circumstances. I have pursued reflexivity in making an elaborate historical and present-day context to position the data production, research relations and writing. I have furthermore sought to explain how I comprehend the subject constitution of both myself and the research participants. Furthermore, I have attempted to outline how this research as a discursive practice has emerged.

In trying to author an elaborate context for the study, I have also participated in making the narratives of the Roma, Travellers and nation-states/Europe/world. Although seeking a reflexive narrative, I am worried that the emphasis on the conflicting relations between the Roma, Travellers and the Nordic nation-states in publication III downplays how Roma and Travellers have taken part in the societies in multiple ways: the economies and armies for instance (see, e.g., Tervonen 2012a). Thus, I am worried that the narrative I constructed marginalizes the Roma and Travellers. Although I explicitly take the viewpoint of the trajectories of policy categories in publication III and the violence committed by the nation-state to enable an understanding of the trajectory of the category of race as well, I am still concerned that this narrative may become too simplistic and actually marginalize and otherize Roma and Traveller groups (cf. Kalsås 2019). I have tried to complicate the narrative in this summary (chapter 2).

When it comes to positioning the research in historical and social contexts, challenging the research tradition of studies ”about the Other” (see Ahmed 2000; also Tuori 2009; Matache 2017a) has constituted one guiding notion for this research. This study focuses on discourses and relations of power in terms of structures instead of individuals or groupings. This focus impacted the data production and the nature of the research relations (chapter 4.3.4), which likewise introduces a certain distance for the writing process: the attempt is not to claim that I could understand and represent the experiences or feelings of my research participants. The realisation of not being able to comprehend the research participant becomes an ethical stance in analysis and writing (see also Oinas 2004). Thus, I do not claim to *know* the research participant or to produce knowledge about them.

Although the researcher cannot *know* and capture the research participant, I also follow line of argument by Yasmin Gunaratnam (2003, 22) in which she says that the research practice should be “able to make links between lived experience, political relations and the production of knowledge” (see also Weedon 1987). I argue that the choice of theories in this research enables this link Gunaratnam is calling for. Although I am not attempting to know my research participants or to claim to understand their experiences, I can, however, analyse how lived and described experience is connected to particular social structures and processes (Weedon 1987). Furthermore, the knowledge production of the lived experiences and the particular processes producing them emerges in webs of power which I have aimed to explicate in this summary. Through these considerations I have aimed not to claim I *know* my research participants but to link their accounts to the webs of power and scrutinise current relations of power through this.

I have written this study in the first person to emphasise that I have authored this text through research practices in the discourses available. This author and the choices reported may also be criticized (see also Mietola 2013). The research participants have not had the opportunity to take part in most of the phases of this

research process, although this process became possible through their involvement. An obvious problem in research relations is that the research participants take their time and share their expertise, but the researcher receives the recognition for the work. In fact, I have been extremely careful in anonymizing the research participants: to assure their anonymity I have concealed characteristics such as gender, age, place of residence and the details of their work. I find that in research anonymizing as an ethical practice has become "naturalized". It is one of the first issues the researcher takes into consideration to prevent harming the research participants. I likewise have promised anonymity to my research participants. Some researchers have, however, claimed that the participants should appear in the research with their names to deconstruct the power relations between the researcher and research participants (e.g., Martin, cited in Oinas 2004). This seems a tempting option in a research field and tradition which has otherized and silenced Roma and Travellers and where Roma and Travellers have had little opportunity to take part in the academic knowledge production. One of my interviewees expressed disappointment when I told that the interviewees would be anonymized (see also chapter 4.3.3). The interviewee found that my decision to anonymize the interview reproduced the invisibility of Roma representation in issues concerning them. Furthermore, the interviewee called for recognition for participating in this study. I want to bring up this discussion with my research participant because it illustrates the fact that my research setting is in debt to my research participants. There is little reciprocity. This discussion also illustrates the relations of power which are not overcome in this research – there is no way to argue against the points raised by the interviewee. I find, however, that using the names of my research participants would risk concealing my authorship and authority of this research. This would obscure the power relations of this study – the narrative and analysis is eventually constructed through the research practices I have carried out (cf. Ahmed 2000) and I cannot validate this research with the names of my interviewees.

5 The results: Presenting the sub-studies

In this section, I present the sub-studies this study consists of: two articles (Publication I & II) and a book chapter (publication III). These three sub-studies together offer a transnational and translocal understanding of the discursive landscape surrounding policies and practices aiming to promote the basic education of Roma and Traveller national minorities. I have attempted to understand and articulate the relations of power and subjectivities that are constituted. Each sub-study takes its unique perspective on the policies and practices in question. Publication I scrutinises the problem representations by the policies applying to Roma, Travellers and basic education in Finland, Sweden and Norway. Publication II concentrates on one practice, the work of Roma mediators, and analyses the subject constitution of Finnish Roma mediators in relation to the tolerance discourse closely using ethnographic interview data. Publication III, a book chapter, draws from the interview data from all three countries, elaborating the practice of providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers in schools. These three sub-studies together illuminate some aspects of the promotion of the basic education of Roma and Travellers in Finland, Sweden and Norway, the complex relations between power and the possible subjectivities.

5.1 Publication I: Policy measures in basic education problematizing Roma and Travellers

> RQ1: What kind of representations of problems are constituted by the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian policy measures on Roma, Travellers and basic education? (Publication I)

The article *Equality in the making? Roma and Traveller policies and basic education in three Nordic countries*, written together with Sirpa Lappalainen and Reetta Mietola, starts with a description of the internationalization of minority rights, Roma and Traveller policies, and the major role of education in policies striving for equality, inclusion and human rights for Roma and Travellers. We consider the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian policies on Roma, Travellers and basic education, analysing what are constituted as problems by the policies and how Roma and Traveller groups are perceived. We analyse central national policy documents concerning national minority Roma and Traveller groups (N=5) as well as national curricula (N=3) from each country (see chapter 4, table 1). In policy documents concerning Roma and Travellers, we concentrate on those sections which specifically discuss basic education. From curricula, we focus on

sections which refer to national minorities and more specifically Roma and Traveller groups.

Whereas the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian curricula resemble each other, the policy documents on Roma and Travellers diverge from each other, reflecting the dissimilarities between the Roma and Traveller politics in these three countries (see chapter 2.4). The Finnish and Swedish Roma policies resemble each other in their form, being national strategies promulgated by the government and having clear sections with measures on the education of the Roma. In Norway, it became necessary to include three different policy documents on Roma and/or Travellers in the data to obtain a view of the discursive field. The white paper tabled by the Norwegian government in 2000, *National minorities in Norway: About state policy on Jews, Kvens, Roma, Travellers, and Forest Finns* (St. Meld. 2000), works as a steering policy document in Norway. It describes the general policies on national minorities in Norway, but the discussion specifically on the Roma, Travellers and basic education is slight. The Norwegian government is now planning a new white paper on national minorities (Regjeringen.no 2018). To get a grasp specifically of the ways the Roma minority is discussed, we included the policy document *Action plan for improvement of the living conditions of Roma in Oslo* (AID 2009), which was released in 2009 and introduced specific policy measures. At the time of writing publication I, the action plan and its implementation had already been evaluated, finding some of the measures inefficient (Tyldum & Friberg, 2014), but a new operative policy had not been written for the Roma either (see also Hagatun 2019a). A striking difference in the Norwegian policy from the Finnish and Swedish Roma policies was that there were no clear measures targeting basic education (see also Hagatun 2019a; Tyldum & Friberg 2014). Basic education was only mentioned in other contexts and thus we could only get hints of similarities or differences in the discursive terrain. To include a policy document on Norwegian Travellers, we chose to analyse the green paper *Assimilation and resistance in Norwegian policies towards Tater/Romani people from 1850 to the present* (NOU 2015) which was released in 2015. The hearings for the green paper ended at the end of autumn 2016. In spring 2019, it seems that the green paper will not lead to a specific policy on Travellers. However, the green paper may be used in formulating a new white paper about national minorities in Norway. This green paper describes the history and present day circumstances of Travellers in Norway in great detail but, being a green paper, it does not advocate clear policy measures. Thus, as with the Norwegian Roma policy, basic education is approached in a very descriptive and even dialogic manner and no clear measures are nailed down.

In the article, we show that general policy aims promoting execution of human rights and minority rights in the Finnish and Swedish Roma policies are translated into measures which respond to special needs of Roma pupils (problem representation 1). These needs are validated by problem representations regarding

Roma parents and families: Roma pupils are described as having a need for special support, reason for which is imposed on Roma families (problem representation 2). Thus the texts constitute Roma as the focus of action. The descriptions in Norwegian Roma policy bear similarities to problem representation 1 and contain problem representation 2, whereas the green paper on Norwegian Travellers contain depictions both similar to and differing from problem representation 2. All the policy documents, including curricula, focus on and problematize the relationship between Roma and Traveller cultures and school (problem representation 3).

Table 2. Listing of policy documents containing or suggesting similarities to identified problem representation

	Problem Representation 1: Special Needs of Roma Pupils	**Problem Representation 2. Roma Families**	**Problem Representation 3. National Minority Cultures in Schools**
Finnish Roma policy	x	x	x
Finnish curriculum			x
Swedish Roma policy	x	x	x
Swedish curriculum			x
Norwegian national minority policy			x
Norwegian local Roma policy	similarities	x	x
Norwegian green paper about Travellers		similarities	x
Norwegian curriculum			x

Problem representation 1, "Special Needs of Roma pupils", was identified in Finnish and Swedish Roma policies where the suggested policy measures recurrently propose special support and attention to Roma children in schools. In the Finnish policy, Roma children were described as a homogenous group, for example, by stating that schools need to pay special attention to Roma children's "mastery of Finnish/Swedish and mathematical and fine motor skills" (MSAH

2009, pp. 44). The Swedish policy document does not make the same type of essentializing descriptions of Roma as the Finnish Roma policy, but it does claim that Roma pupils have particular needs and require support. The measures try to identify those needs and the right kind of support. The three Norwegian Roma and/or Traveller policy texts differ from each other and from the Finnish and Swedish ones. As I have shown in the table above (table 2), neither general national minority policy from Norway nor the green paper on Travellers portray Roma and/or Traveller pupils as in need of special support. The Norwegian Roma policy, however, resembles the Finnish and Swedish Roma policies in presenting Roma pupils as in need of special support such as adapted instruction in Norwegian or a "support framework to ensure that children come to school" (AID 2009, 27). These statements are, however, based on some head teachers' views and the document does not draw clear conclusions from these notions. The Norwegian Roma policy is all in all very different from the other minority policies since it does not shape the promotion of basic education of Roma pupils as a policy aim. Thus, the policy document hints at similar reasoning in education to the Finnish and Swedish ones while remaining ambiguous in leaving out basic education from specified areas of improvement.

Problem representation 2, "Roma Families", was identified especially in Finnish and Swedish Roma policies where reasons for the special needs of Roma pupils were presented as caused by inadequacies in parenting. The Norwegian minority policies produce descriptions both akin and divergent. In the Finnish Roma policy, most of the measures are based on arguments that the schools need to compensate for families' lack of possibilities to support the school attendance of the Roma pupils. There are statements such as

> As many Roma parents lack the ability to support their children in their studies, special support for learning skills and abilities is needed especially in schools. (MSAH 2009, 43)

We argue that the policy text portrays the Roma as lacking the preconditions to participate in the Finnish school institution (see also Araújo 2016; Picker & Rocchggiani 2014). The Swedish policy text, however, problematizes Roma parents slightly differently, as being doubtful of schools. There are statements such as "measures to increase the likelihood of parents wanting to support their children's education are very important" (Skr. 2011, 27). Thus, instead of parents being portrayed as being incapable of supporting their children in school as in the Finnish policy, the Swedish policy suggests the parents are not willing to support their children. In addition to this, the Swedish Roma parents are described in terms of emotions such as fear, in terms of their relation to their children's school attendance. These emotions of parents are targeted with suggested measures: for instance, workers with a Roma background in schools are proposed "to help to

ensure that parents feel more comfortable having their children in the school" (Skr 2011, 30). Our analysis highlights that Roma parents and families are portrayed as emotional rather than rational, focusing the measures on the feelings of Roma individuals rather than on the possible root causes for suspicions such as discrimination or racism. In the Norwegian Roma policy, the perceptions of Roma families resemble both Finnish and Swedish Roma policies in that Roma families are described both as incompetent in relation to the school institution and as having an emotional relation to schooling. Roma parents are, for example, described as being afraid of their children being bullied. Instead of suggesting measures to counter the bullying that has been found in Norwegian schools (see, e.g., Hagatun 2019b), resolving the anxiety of parents is discussed:

> The Government aims to provide satisfactory educational programmes for all children, including Roma. However, many Roma are anxious that their children will be bullied at school and in the day care owing to their ethnic background. The experience of Sweden, among other countries, shows that teaching assistants with Roma background in schools and day care institutions help to alleviate this anxiety, while providing valuable role models for the children. (AID 2009, 34)

As in the excerpt above from the Norwegian Roma policy, in Finnish and Swedish Roma policies there is also a notion of a lack of role models for Roma pupils. While this notion may be interpreted as referring to under-representation of Roma in positions of power in the society, it likewise implies that none of the adults in the Roma pupil's family are suitable role models. Thus, we claim that this notion contributes to portraying Roma families as unsuitable growing environments for the pupils to become part of the current school institution.

The Norwegian green paper on Traveller policy does not propose specific measures in basic education. However, the descriptions of Norwegian Traveller families in the green paper follow the same tendencies as the Roma policies: the parents are depicted as sceptical of schools. As in Swedish and Norwegian Roma policies, parents are represented as afraid of their children being bullied or as anxious that schools have different goals from the families for the upbringing of the children (AID 2009, 107–108). However, the character of the green paper as a policy text leaves it undefined whether it is the feelings of the parents or the bullying and possibility of diverging goals for upbringing that constitute the problem.

Problem representation 3, "National Minority Cultures in Schools", was found in all the documents analysed. Each document discusses Roma and/or Traveller cultures in some manner and the policy measures focus on the relationship between national minority cultures and schools. We categorised the manifold ways of problematizing national minority cultures in schools into three

themes: *lack of knowledge about Roma and Traveller cultures* which was found in all the documents; *problematic traditions*, which was particularly stressed in the Swedish and Norwegian Roma and Traveller policies; and *Romani languages and cultures in need of support* which was an emphasis in the Finnish and Swedish curricula.

As said, all the policies consider the lack of knowledge about Roma and Traveller cultures. The Roma and Traveller policies claim that in order to promote equality in schools, more knowledge about Roma and Travellers among teachers, teacher educators, and other pupils is needed. In Finnish and Swedish policies, this knowledge has the explicit tasks of making people treat Roma with respect and enabling schools to preserve Roma language and culture. In the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian curricula, knowledge about the groups or national minorities in general are mentioned as part of the subject content, such as social sciences and history. Although knowledge about Roma and Travellers is understood as important for promotion of equality, the texts do not elaborate what this knowledge is, how it should be used, or who generates it. In addition to lack of knowledge, another minority culture related theme in the Swedish and Norwegian Roma and Traveller policies is cultural traditions as a problem for school attendance. For example, the Swedish Roma policy declares that "certain customs and practices such as child marriage and early pregnancies" (Skr. 2011, 25) accounts partially for the absenteeism of the pupils. A particular concern of Roma girls being kept out of school by their parents is also raised.

Travelling is important in Norwegian Roma, Traveller and general national minority policy. The texts do not, however, determine where the problem with the travelling of Roma and Travellers lies in relations with school: whether the problem is the tradition in itself or the fact that the schools are not able to develop practices which would ensure the education for pupils from minorities who may travel part of the school year. Thus, the policies do not aim to end family travelling, but they are hesitant in relation to how much schools should accommodate to possible travelling.

The third minority culture related theme found in the Finnish and Swedish curricula is Romani language and culture as resources which need to be supported. The Finnish and Swedish curricula contain Romani language syllabi and, in these sections of curricula, Romani language and culture are emphasised as resources that need to be preserved. However beyond the Romani language syllabi, references to these groups are scarce. Stemming from the Norwegian Basic Education Act, the Norwegian curriculum states that the curriculum for language minorities is only transitional until the pupil is sufficiently competent in Norwegian. Thus, mother tongues of national minority pupils are not supported as they are in the Finnish and Swedish curricula.

The closing argument of the article is that there are clear restrictions on how the marginalizing mechanisms of the school systems are confronted by the

policies. We thus claim that the current formulation of policy measures and their focus constrain change in terms of equality in education.

5.2 Publication II: Power relations of tolerance enabling and constraining subject constitution of Roma mediators

> **RQ2.** What kind of subject constitution and agency is enabled and constrained for the Finnish Roma mediators by the current discursive terrain around prejudice and tolerance in schools? (Publication II)

In the article *Becoming tolerable: subject constitution of Roma mediators in Finnish schools*, written together with Sirpa Lappalainen and Fritjof Sahlström, we concentrate on one prevalent practice: the work of Roma mediators. By analysing thematic and ethnographic interviews and participant observations in four municipalities in Finland, we scrutinize the processes of subject constitution, i.e., the subjectification of the Roma mediators.

Roma mediators is a widely-promoted practice in international Roma policies (see, e.g., CoE 2012; European Union 2012; Kyuchukov 2012). The principle for the work of Roma mediators is that individuals identifying as Roma or sometimes a non-Roma individual with comprehensive knowledge about Roma culture and communities are educated to operate as mediators between the Roma and public institutions. In the Finnish school context, they are typically teaching assistants with a Roma background (see also Helakorpi 2013). In Sweden, the mediators are called *brobyggare* (see Rodell Olgaç & Dimiter-Taikon 2016). In Norway, they have likewise developed a version of Roma mediators in schools (see chapter 2.5; Hagatun 2019a).

The work of the Finnish mediators varied between municipalities. The biggest difference was whether the research participants worked as general teaching assistants for all the pupils in one school or whether they worked exclusively with Roma pupils in each school where there were Roma pupils in their municipality and even in neighbouring municipalities. Most of the participants were responsible for Romani language education in their municipality. The interviewees organized clubs, camps and events for Roma pupils and families. For the school community and the municipality, they arranged culture days, lectures and exhibitions about Roma culture, and so on. One of the interviewees no longer worked as a Roma mediator.

In the article, we suggest that the Roma mediators need to appear 'worth tolerance' in order to carry out their work. In terms of subjectification (see also chapter 3.2.1) we state thus that some of the relations of power which produce the subject and provide the conditions of the existence of the subject (Foucault 1980; 1983; Butler 1997a) are the power relations of tolerance. There are lengthy, ambivalent roots for the concept of tolerance (Hage 2000; Goldberg 2004; Brown

2006). Tolerance is often presented as a political counterforce against racism and discrimination (Hage 2000). In the article, we utilize David Theo Goldberg's (2004) notion of the asymmetrical power relations produced by tolerance discourse, which positions people as those who may become tolerated and those in the positions of tolerating agents (see also Hage 2000; Brown 2006). Those in the position of possibly being tolerated are required to show that they deserve to be tolerated (Goldberg 2004). Thus, the terms for toleration are established through the tolerating agent's position of power.

The accounts of many of the interviewees described how they have promoted tolerance themselves in their education and work: "I could share that kind of tolerance and then, like, promote it there" (interviewee). In their accounts, however, it becomes evident that they need to do this by deserving to be tolerated themselves first, as an interviewee describes in the following excerpt:

> R: And I feel that it's good for everybody among the majority children as well that they learn to accept and get to know [a Roma person]. There are many kinds of us in every culture and also in our culture there are people who don't know how to behave. But when they get to know me they find out that not everyone is the same.
> I: Mm.
> R: If they have come across a person who couldn't behave, then they hopefully get a better experience from me.

The interviewee's account describes a requirement to act in a manner which "gives a better experience" of the Roma in order to promote acceptance, i.e., tolerance. This "better experience", I find, is evaluated against racialized perceptions about the Roma (see chapter 3.2.2). In the research participants' accounts, they describe having had to earn their place, for instance, when their fellow-students, colleagues or pupils' parents have expressed suspicion towards them. The research participants talked about these prejudices and attitudes towards the Roma and themselves as being a self-evident part of the work: the Roma had a dubious status and my research participants wanted to ensure that they were recognized as good workers themselves. Many of them reported, for instance, that they do twice as much work as others simply because they are Roma. Although sometimes the participants expressed anger about the situation, most described it just as part of everyday life. The interviewees also expressed understanding for the people expressing the prejudices: the interviewees excused those expressing prejudices/acting racist by describing them as lacking education, being afraid or perhaps having met badly behaving Roma. For instance, an interviewee described a situation where a teacher had assaulted them and expressed hate of the Roma in front of a pupil. The interviewee talked about the

event with apparent anger and described how they had argued with the teacher and left the classroom. Then the interviewee continued:

> R: The student was looking all astonished (gives a laugh) you know. That the teacher started when the student was there, to attack me there.
> I: (clucks)
> R: Well, the teacher was a bit, a quite special character.
> I: Yeah, phew.

Thus the non-Roma were stripped of responsibility for their prejudiced acts, "well, the teacher was a bit, a quite special character". Furthermore, the interviewees took the responsibility for changing the prejudiced views by appearing tolerant themselves. The interviewees also found that they needed to provide the right kind of knowledge about the Roma (see also publication III).

The research participants described strategies they employed to deal with the prejudice they faced in their work. We identified three strategies which we have described as negotiations within the current discourses. The first strategy we called *finding commonality*. The interviewees described how they actively sought commonality with non-Roma in their work. One interviewee described how they attempted to show that the Roma share the same culture and the same world as the others. The interviewees sought to prove this by such means as talking about sports as well as everyday issues like food or parenting.

Another strategy we called *parody*.

> R: It's just that kind of humour (laughs) [. . .] often these kinds of jokes [about Roma] or jokes in good taste work as good ice-breakers. Of course they need to be within the limits of good taste. That it doesn't go further.

The interviewees parodied Roma-ness for the school community and in the interviews they explained that humour about Roma enabled them to smooth the path, making the non-Roma feel comfortable.

The third strategy we identified was *feigning naivety*.

> R: If I felt something [prejudiced], I didn't want to accept it as the reality. I just want to do my own thing with my own attitude.

The research participants said that it was important to ignore the prejudice they face. We interpret this as illustrating how it is difficult to have confrontations regarding race/ethnicity. The Roma mediators are required to remain positive at all times when promoting tolerance with their embodied Roma-ness.

Educating Roma mediators is seen as an important measure in tackling discrimination against the Roma. We conclude that analysis of the relations of

power in the work of Roma mediators and school institutions would benefit the Roma mediator practice. We also argue for a further analysis of racism as a system of power and exclusion which is maintained through institutions such as schools. Otherwise we find the danger of concealing the discriminatory structures and processes which contribute to marginalising Roma pupils is great.

5.3 Publication III: The insufficiency of the practice of providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers

> **RQ3.** How does the discursive terrain around the practice of providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers in schools function? (Publication III)

The book chapter *Knowledge about Roma and Travellers in Nordic Schools: Paradoxes, Constraints and Possibilities* stems from the findings of publications I and II. Since it was prevalent in the policy documents (see 5.1.; publication I) and emerged in tolerance discourses (see 5.2.; article II), I chose to scrutinise the discursive field around provision of knowledge about minoritized groups in schools. Although knowledge provision has such a visible part in Roma and Traveller policy documents in basic education, what constitutes that knowledge, and how it should be applied or generated remains undiscussed.

In the book chapter I characterize "providing knowledge about minoritized groups" as a "travelling discourse" (Lahelma 2005; Lindblad & Popkewitz 2003), which is found in various contexts globally. In the book chapter, I ask how those interviewees in Finland, Sweden and Norway who identify as Roma or Travellers themselves make sense of this practice that they carry out in their own work. The book chapter sets out to investigate the discourses that are available for making sense of this practice (Davies 2004; chapter 4.4). The book chapter starts with a description of how different Roma and Traveller policy categories have emerged and how these groups have been categorized and controlled. I point out the heterogeneity of the groups as well as the violent past of the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian states towards the groups. In the book chapter I identify and name two umbrella themes my interviewees discuss in making sense of this practice: *racialization* and *silence about Roma and Travellers in the nation-states*. I find that my interviewees describe their knowledge provision as reacting to these phenomena.

I argue that the ways in which my interviewees made sense of the practice of providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers point towards the persistence and frequency of processes of racialization of Roma and Travellers in schools. I identified processes of racialization (see chapter 3.2.2) in their accounts where they explained how they challenge dominant narratives about Roma and Travellers – narratives such as Roma (and Travellers) not wanting to go to school

or take part in society or that they are criminals and generally bad people. Furthermore, the interviewees wished to emphasise that Roma and Travellers are heterogeneous people from which I read the racializing practices of schools since homogenizing Roma and Travellers presents one element of racialization.

In the article I, however, argue that with provision of knowledge it is difficult to avoid the logic of racialization although they aim to resist processes which I have identified as racializing. When the interviewees aim to create a counter-narrative to the narratives that racialize Roma and Travellers, they may end-up making homogenizing descriptions. For instance, a Swedish interviewee challenges the narrative of Roma's unwillingness to participate in schooling by talking about "us":

> We will also be in society and we will also work. And that is what I tell the teachers.

This essentializing and homogenizing "we" I understand as strategic, to enable a counter narrative (cf. Eide 2015). This, however still cannot entirely challenge the logic of racialization since it represents the Swedish Roma as one homogenous group that one person represents. The emphasis on the heterogeneity of Roma and Travellers however became a parallel strategy in my interviewees' accounts. These contradictory strategies represent one of the paradoxes. This, however, frequently resulted in my interviewees reproducing the narrative of some Roma who are the reason for "prejudices" about the Roma (cf. publication II; chapter 5.2). In the following excerpt, a Norwegian interviewee describes how Roma are racialized in Norwegian society:

> […] I mean the non-Roma [Norwegians], they don't know what we do and what we stand for. And always when they… hear for instance that gypsies (*zigenare*), which we are often called, so, it is that we are bad people. That we steal, we are criminals. That we are not stable. And that is not true. […] There is also [criminality] among Roma. Those who steal and who are criminals. But they are not many. […] (Norwegian interviewee)

When challenging and negotiating with racialization, a number of the interviewees end up even repeating the same narratives which connect criminality or bad behaviour with the Roma in attempting to emphasize that it is not all Roma. This represents one of the paradoxes within the discursive terrain. Thus, they come to accept the racialized figure of criminal and badly behaving Roma when they challenge racialization through the narrative of heterogeneity. They find that it is important to disclose positive narratives about the Roma to replace the negative ones. I argue that the notion of making positive representations instead of negative

ones illustrates how it is embedded in the discourse of providing knowledge about minoritized groups that the groups are shaped as responsible for the perceptions people in privileged positions have: either there has been an individual who has caused the racialized perceptions about Roma for the non-Roma or the Roma have not given enough (positive) information about themselves. Regardless, Roma become responsible for the current state of affairs and processes of racialization. Furthermore, they become responsible for the change-making (cf. Lorde 1984). Non-Roma/Travellers are not held liable for the persistent reproduction of racializing narratives about Roma and Travellers, or for changing those narratives.

The other umbrella theme I identified to which the interviewees reacted was silence about Roma and Travellers in the nation-states. I identified this theme in their accounts describing people knowing little about the history, present or even existence of Roma and Travellers. One Norwegian Traveller interviewee described the following:

> Because they don't know anything about us. They believe we were people who lived 300 years ago in an adventure book. But we do exist today.

In publication I (chapter 5.1.), we called for discussion about the content, application and production of knowledge about Roma and Travellers. In making Roma and Travellers visible in the nation-state, the question about the content arose. My analysis suggests that the content was negotiated within different contexts, especially when it came to the relationship between Roma, Travellers and the nation-states. Many Swedish interviewees described the relationship between Roma and the Swedish nation-state through historical atrocities and current discrimination, which can be understood as an oppositional and antagonistic positioning.

> Then, when we talk about the history, we go to the Second World War, we go into Josef Mengele, what he, what Hitler did with the Roma. How it was in the 1970s. How the change took place. And then we come to the fact that today they are still an oppressed group. Even today, 2015. They don't have their rights. And I mean we live in a Swedish society. It should be different. It is not so today. (Interviewee, Sweden)

Furthermore, in these descriptions, the Swedish state came to be represented as unequal and oppressive. The Finnish interviewees had a different perspective. The majority of the Finnish interviewees took a happier approach to history than the Swedish interviewees, referencing cultural artefacts, music, clothing and the micro-histories of individual Roma. The relationship between Roma and the Finnish state became marginalized in the narratives.

> I usually don't want to bring these up [historical atrocities] because it kind of undermines the issue. People stay and chew over the wrong [issue], and they even freeze. The truth is that in history, there are these hard issues, which also often cause the fears that Roma have. (Interviewee, Finland)

I understand this as my interviewee's strategy: previous studies show that working with diversity in institutions is often better executed in "happier language", because emphasising issues such as racism or historical misconduct may result in the majority's lack of interest in co-operating (Ahmed 2012, 175). According to my reading, in Finnish schools there is little room to present the historical mistreatment of Roma (see also publication II; chapter 5.2). The Norwegian Traveller interviewees on the other hand used "happy" multiculturalism to narrate the oppressiveness of the Norwegian state.

> So that it is a little bit like play [acting], […] so, that they do in schools […] when they teach the young. Live our life and get dressed like Travellers. So, they dress like us and live like our life. So then they encounter resistance from society. […] so the people who have been a bit negative, when they begin, they become totally the opposite. Thus, they understand. "Oh, is it like this?" Yes. Then they understand it, when they get to live it a little themselves. Thus, it does something to them. […].

In the chapter, I link the ways to narrate the relations with nation-states to the larger societal context. The Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian states have perceived the history and presence in different ways. The Norwegian government apologised to Travellers in 1998 and 2000 (NOU 2015, p. 7; St. Meld. no. 15, 2000–2001, p. 7) and Roma in 2015 (government.no, 2015) for historical atrocities. Sweden released a white paper *The dark and unknown history: White Paper on abuses and the rights violations of Roma during the 1900s* (AMD 2014) – which also resulted in the founding of a commission against antiziganism from 2014 to 2016 (SOU 2016). An extensive public discussion about discrimination of Roma was also conducted in Sweden when it was revealed that the police had kept an illegal register about Roma. The Finnish state has never given an account of the abuse and persecution of Roma (see also Nordberg 2015), whereas the practices of schools impact on how the relationship between Roma, Travellers and nation-states are discussed, and the differing public discourses enable certain types of narratives.

One of my interviewees said that the knowledge they provide is about the norms in schools. Thus, their viewpoint differed from the other interviewees as well as from the policy measures. However, the interviewee said that they needed to be careful not to make the school staff or other officials feel guilty or criticised. I consider this a symptom of how the interviewee once more has to take the

responsibility, this time for the emotional side, not making others feel bad (see also publication II; chapter 5.2.).

I conclude the chapter by stating that the current discourses provide a position of innocence for those who are privileged. I draw the conclusion that the school communities and policymakers should analyse and tackle racializing processes. Those processes are prevalent and the responsibility for tackling them cannot be put solely on the shoulders of minoritized groups. I furthermore conclude that an elaborate rethinking of those narratives that are produced about nation-states is required (see also Osler & Lybaek 2014). The historical and current role in producing injustice and racism should be scrutinised broadly within societies and institutions. Scrutinising injustice and racism should not be the sole responsibility of those who occupy minoritized positions and are racialized (see also Lorde 1984). The analysis in the chapter suggests that the policy measure of the provision of knowledge about minoritized groups should be expanded so that schools and institutions are held responsible for rethinking and re-narrating the nation-state and its institutions.

5.4 Summary of the publications

To summarise publications I, II and III, I recapitulate that with my co-authors we have identified three problem representations from the policy documents on Roma, Travellers and basic education: 1. “Special Needs of Roma pupils”, 2. “Roma families” and 3. “National minority cultures in school” (publication I; chapter 5.1). The policy documents do not target racism and structural discrimination, but do make Roma and Travellers the centre of attention. Furthermore, the policy documents provide homogenizing descriptions of these heterogenous groups. The policy documents promote knowledge about Roma and Travellers but do not disclose the content, application or production of this knowledge.

One of the practices the policy documents promote is Roma mediators, whose work is validated by the above mentioned problem representations. In their work, however, the opportunities for change are limited by uneven power relations (publication II; chapter 5.2). The mediators need to act in accordance with the terms set for becoming tolerated. They are perceived as representatives of all Roma, and assumed to work against biases with their own presence. In multiple ways, the responsibility for change is placed on the shoulders of the Roma mediators and racism/discrimination is depoliticised.

One practice that the policies promote but do not elaborate on is the provision of knowledge about Roma and Travellers (publication I). This practice is applied by the actors promoting the basic education of Roma and Travellers. They develop and carry out in practice the ambiguous policy notion and they thus give the policy notion its content. I have analysed how the interviewees who identify as Roma or

Traveller themselves make sense of this practice in publication III, arguing that most of the interviewees are reacting to two umbrella themes with their knowledge provision: 1. racialization of Roma and 2. silence about Roma and Travellers in the nation-states. I point out the paradoxes in the current discursive field around knowledge provision: the logic of racialization is difficult to overcome within knowledge discourse. I likewise highlight that the interviewees' narration about Roma, Travellers and nation-states are enabled and constrained both by the school context and national context. The analysis highlights that the notion of providing knowledge involves the premise that the responsibility for change and transformation is on the Roma. I argue that while the current policies and practices focus on Roma and Travellers, they provide an innocent position for others.

6 Conclusions

In this chapter I will pull together the three individual publications. I will address the research objectives and articulate the relations of power and possible subjectivities that are produced in the current discursive terrain. I will also draw the attention to relations of power, the enabled and constrained subjectivities, silence about race and whiteness, paradoxes in provision of knowledge about minoritized groups and national minority-ness.

6.1 Power relations and subjectivities

Understandings of Roma-ness, Traveller-ness and majority-ness are shaped in the promotion of basic education of Roma and Travellers. Scholars have criticised the current policy work as well as research on the Roma and school for repeating problematic descriptions of Roma and Travellers and for not analysing the relations of power (e.g., Matache 2017b; Brüggeman 2014). To contribute to the discussion about the power relations within the promotion of basic education of the Roma and Travellers, I discuss my three publications jointly, bringing together the discourses that I have identified and discussed in the publications in table 3. By *discourse* I have referred to knowledge formations which enable our thinking and acting (see Foucault 1972; St. Pierre 2000; chapter 3.2.1). Discourses are constituted historically, socially, culturally and institutionally. In table 3, I furthermore designate those relations of power that work within and through the identified discourses. Relations of power are inseparable from discourses, in which power and knowledge are intertwined (Foucault 1978). One articulation and form of power is subject constitution, i.e., subjectification (Foucault 1980; Butler 1997a). One is rendered a subject and subjected to relations of power through discourses (see Youdell 2006a). Subjectivities are constituted through the processes of subjectification, through discourses, in the play of relations of power. Subjectivity in this research refers to the sense of self and the sense of relations between self and others (Weedon 1987; 2004; Davies 1993). In table 3. I likewise define subjectivities, the sense(s) of self and relations to others that are enabled and constrained through the identified discourses.

Table 3. Discourses, relations of power, and subjectivities in publications I, II and III

	Discourse	**RO1: Relations of power**	**RO2: Subjectivities**	
			Roma and Travellers	Others
Publication I (PI)	1. Pupils with special needs	Need and help	Pupil with special needs	Helper
	2. Parents who cannot or will not support their children	Adequate and inadequate	Inadequate parent	Helper and adequate
	3. Provision of knowledge about Roma and Travellers	Knowledge about the Other	Provider of knowledge Object of knowledge	The one who does not know
	4. Protecting minority language and culture (FI & SWE)	Majority/minority	Minority mother tongue speaker, practitioner of minority culture	Majority
Publication II (PII)	5. Tolerance	Tolerance	Tolerated	Tolerating actor
Publication III (PIII)	3. Provision of knowledge about Roma and Travellers	Knowledge about the Other	Provider of knowledge Object of knowledge	The one who does not know

I identify here five discourses, knowledge formations, through which individuals are subjected to relations of power: (1.) pupils with special needs (PI), (2.) parents who cannot or will not support their children (PI), (3.) provision of knowledge (PI&III) (4.) protecting minority language and culture (PI) and (5.) tolerance (PII).

When we look at the discursive terrain within policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education, we observe how most of the discourses subject individuals to relations of power which are asymmetrical. To start with, the discourses of (1.) "pupils with special needs" and of (2.) "parents who cannot or will not support their children" show that these subject individuals to relations of power of "need and help" and "inadequacy and adequacy". Thus, Roma and

Travellers in the context of basic education become framed as demanding help and as inadequate. The subjectivities these relations of power provide for Roma (and Travellers) may be described as "pupils with special needs" and "inadequate parents/families". [32] For others, these relations of power offer subjectivities as adequate and as those who help the Roma and Traveller pupils and families through offering them the right kind of support.

Discourse (3.) "provision of knowledge about Roma and Travellers" (PI and PIII) follows the same tendencies as the first two discourses. The discourse subjects individuals to relations of power which I conceptualise here as "knowledge about the Other". In this discourse, the relations of power become asymmetrical as well. The possible subjectivities that are produced for Roma and Travellers are sense of self as those who are obliged to provide knowledge as well as required to be objects of knowledge. For others, a subjectivity as one who does not know is produced. As described in publication III, at the heart of the discourse is the notion that not knowing about minoritised groups causes discrimination. In each of the publications, I have found that this line of thinking makes Roma and Travellers the centre of attention and responsible for not saying enough about themselves, thus causing the discrimination themselves. It furthermore strips away the responsibility of non-Roma/non-Travellers for discrimination or racism.

Through discourse (5.) on tolerance, Roma are acquired to appear the right way, as tolerable (PII). The discourse of tolerance (5.) subjects individuals to power relations of tolerance providing the Roma a subjectivity of those who may be tolerated, whereas for other than Roma this discourse provides a subjectivity as the possibly tolerating actor.

In publication I, I also identify discourse about (4.) protecting national minority culture and language, which emerges in Finnish and Swedish curricula. This is apparent in my interview data, although I have not analysed this in the present study. I argue that through this discourse one is subjected to power relations of majority-ness and minority-ness. One is provided with a sense of self as a minority mother-tongue speaker and practitioner of a minority culture. This subjectivity is both vulnerable (endangered language and culture) and has resources (its own language and culture). This discourse was present in the documents in a limited way in considering basic education. This discourse, however, may enable more potential for subjectivities than the other discourses. Instead of producing Roma and Travellers as under evaluation in relation to becoming adequate and tolerable, the rights and resources of minoritised groups become objects of thought.

Linking the results of the three publications together, it seems that other than Roma and Travellers are accorded a subjectivity, a sense of self, as not responsible for the change or as innocent. Through the discourse of adequacy/inadequacy,

[32] As described in publication I and chapter 5.1, the first two problem representations were found in Roma policies in Finland, Sweden and Norway.

Roma and Travellers become responsible for becoming adequate. Others are provided with subjectivities as those who are adequate and those who help Roma and Travellers to change and become adequate. Although the helper subjectivity also requires action and responsibility to help and support, the presumed inadequacy and thus change is imposed on Roma and Travellers. Through the discourse of provision of knowledge (PI and PIII), the subjectivity of innocence is enabled through making Roma and Travellers responsible for producing (and not producing) accounts of themselves which others may receive. In publication III it is shown how the power relations of "knowledge about the Other" make Roma and Travellers responsible both for the current narratives as well as for changing them, whereas, others are yet again accorded a subjectivity as not responsible as well as a subjectivity of innocence. Furthermore, also the discourse of tolerance formulates a subjectivity for Roma and Travellers as those responsible for the change. Other than Roma are offered a subjectivity of not being responsible or of innocence.

6.2 Renewing whiteness as a norm and privilege: Silence about racism and structural discrimination

As described at the outset, Roma and Travellers have been and are discriminated against in Finland, Sweden and Norway (e.g., Castaneda et. al. 2018; Keskinen et. al. 2018; Non-discrimination ombudsman 2014; NOU 2015; Rosvoll & Bielenberg 2014; SOU 2016). Both in publications II and III, I argue that based on my data, racialization of Roma and Travellers is ongoing in the Nordic schools. As described in section 3.2.2, I perceive racialisation as those processes where race as a political and social category is produced and maintained (e.g., Lentin 2008). Race I understand as a category produced through discourses which enable racism as a system of power (Hall 2000, 222). Racialization occurs in relation to whiteness as a norm (Keskinen & Andreassen 2017). Race, racism and racialization may be thus perceived as processes maintaining whiteness as a system of power and privilege (Lorde 1984; Ahmed 2004).

I find it remarkable that the policies analysed (or policy measures in the policy documents) downplay discrimination and racism in schools by making Roma and Traveller pupils, families and cultures the focus of attention (publication I). In the light of critical research, however, silence about racism and discrimination in policies is not a surprising result. Margareta Matache (2017b) has argued that the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies (NRIS) – one of the international policy processes which is impacting Finnish and Swedish Roma policies especially (see chapter 2.3 and 2.4) –in fact contain biases and racist beliefs about the Roma. Marta Araújo (2014) has claimed that the current integration frameworks in European Roma policies depoliticize racism and anti-racism. My study has disclosed the same kind of tendencies in the Finnish,

Swedish and Norwegian policies on Roma, Travellers, and basic education. Racism and anti-racism in particular are depoliticized by the policies and the focus of policy attention is on Roma and Traveller pupils, families and cultures in schools. The policies do not permit identifying and tackling racism as a structural phenomenon and as relations of power since the phenomenon of racism is marginalised by the policies. When racism is not discussed and identified as a phenomenon, it is difficult to target the processes that maintain racism such as racialization (see Andreassen and Ahmed-Andresen 2013; Araujo 2016; Molina 2005). I have, however, argued in publications II and III that the participants of my study aim to challenge the racialisation of Roma and Travellers in their practices.

I find that the innocent subjectivity that is offered to the non-Roma/non-Travellers by the current discourses functions for and signals racism and whiteness as systems of power and privilege. Whiteness becomes the norm in relation to which Roma and Travellers are exposed to subjectivities of inadequacy, needing help and being tolerated (cf. Lorde 1984; Wekker 2014). These subjectivities are thus racialized, maintaining the discursive category of race around which racism as a system is organised. Downplaying the issues of structural discrimination and racism enable and maintain racism and whiteness (e.g., Goldberg 2015). This is further enabled by framing equality and justice as something that is achieved by individual will and commitment by Roma and Travellers (and thus inequality as a failure of those individuals). The persistent spotlight on Roma and Travellers strips the others of responsibility, enabling reproduction of racism and whiteness. Furthermore it enables subjectivities of helpers, supporters and innocence for the non-Roma/non-Travellers. These enabled subjectivities may furthermore be described as the enabled white subjectivities within whiteness as a system of privilege and power.

6.3 Agency in the relations of power in the work of promoting basic education of Roma and Travellers

> So I work at the civil servant level and there it becomes something else… then you have to have the educational, the diplomatic [skills] to encounter the personnel. They are also individuals. One cannot just go and point one's finger at them and say 'you are doing wrong'. We rather need to try to go and say that this here we do together and get them on board (Interviewee, Sweden)

Drawing from poststructural theories, I have perceived an individual's agency as always enabled and constrained by discourse and power. It does not, however, mean lack of agency or that one's agency is pre-determined (Butler 1997a). One's subject constitution, a subject's existence, is dependent on discourses but agency

comes into being where the discourses are renewed (Butler 1995) and the subject itself emerges as "both as the effect of a prior power and as the condition of possibility for a radically conditioned form of agency" (Butler 1997a, 14–15). Butler (1997a) emphasizes this ambivalence in the theory of subject constitution. In order to grasp this ambivalence I have used the verb negotiation (publications II and III; see also chapter 4.3.3) to reveal the agency in how one submits to the discourses and masters them in the process of subject constitution.

I suggest that for the work of promoting Roma and Traveller inclusion or other work aiming for transformation, the findings about *how* agency is enabled and constrained are important. This study has for instance indicated that the subjectification process involves constant negotiations within the discourses of tolerance and provision of knowledge. Furthermore, the discourses, power and subjectivities analysed in this study show that in their subject constitution, Roma and Travellers working within basic education are required to negotiate with racializing discourses.

The current Roma and Traveller politics emphasise the participation of Roma and Travellers in the formulation of policies. It should however be recognised that these types of majority driven policy processes are conditioned (e.g., Stenroos 2019; Toivanen 2015; Kóczé & Rövid 2012). This does not signal that the agency of Roma and Traveller representatives is determined by the majority. However, agency is bound and forms of complicity are included even in resistance and protest (Bacchi & Goodwin 2016, 112). I argue that the ways my interviewees negotiate with such issues as tolerance, racialization and narratives of nation-states signal resistance and complicity. In the excerpt at the beginning of this section, one of the research participants describes how one cannot go and announce to the administrative staff that they are not acting properly. This seems to mean that this participant protests against some of the ways in which current work within administration is conducted; however, in their form of protest the interviewee need to comply with the current discourses and find ways to "do together". This "doing together" necessitates negotiations within the discursive terrain articulated in this study (see also chapter 6.1.). Thus, one is required to find ways to meet one's goals by negotiating within the context (publication II and III).

Seeking to articulate the ways subject constitution and the agency of individuals is enabled and constrained does not signify that there are only some ways to become subjects within the discursive terrain I have discussed. In this concluding chapter, I have roughly articulated five prevalent discourses (see 6.1.) in which the subject constitution is enabled but the description of the discursive field is in no way exhaustive. Discourses e.g. on gender, sexuality and social class are played out in the subject constitution although not analysed in this study. The heterogeneity of my interviewees and their ways to perceive the phenomena is noteworthy although my analysis has concentrated on recognising tendencies within the discourses. However, naming and challenging the discourses of need

and help, inadequacy and adequacy as well as tolerance may give further space for new potential for agency and subject constitution.

6.4 Paradoxes in providing knowledge about minoritised groups in schools

An often-repeated notion is that racism and other discrimination is caused by ignorance, by not knowing something (Lentin 2008; Ahmed 2004). A demand for more knowledge about minoritized groups is a fairly typical measure introduced to promote justice in and through education (see, e.g., ,Gorski 2016; Kumashiro 2002). The idea of "providing knowledge about the other" in schools stems from the presupposition that knowing about minoritized groups evokes feelings of empathy within other pupils, and that this empathy leads to changes in schools and societies (Kumashiro 2002). However, critics have pointed out that claiming that ignorance and not knowing cause racism, depoliticizes and individualises racism (e.g., Lentin 2008). Furthermore what happens is that this claim represents racism as a class issue, as something that those not educated carry out (Ahmed 2004). In other words, racism becomes individualised and the individuals who are "those racists" become positioned in terms of social class and learning. How then should racism be addressed in the context of basic education, policies, teacher education and academia if not in terms of "providing more knowledge"? Throughout this research, I have claimed that racism as a system should be recognised – don't I then produce the idea that knowledge and knowing is the key to change – just other kind of knowledge than that in the policy documents?

My study has shown that a great number of perspectives in the current policies and practices on Roma, Travellers and basic education stem from the demand for more knowledge about the Roma and Travellers. According to my study, this policy measure enables a subjectivity of innocence and not being responsible for others than Roma and Travellers. I have shown how racialization of the Roma and Travellers is ongoing in schools (publications II and III). The research participants respond to and challenge the racializing notions about Roma and Travellers. However, when not knowing about Roma and Travellers is formulated as the problem, Roma and Travellers are made responsible for the current situation since they have not provided enough knowledge about themselves and they need to change this.

I have also shown that whereas the responsibility for change is on the Roma and Travellers within the "knowledge about the Other" discourse, effectuating the actual change is difficult. Racialization leans on homogenizing and essentializing groups and with knowledge about Roma and Travellers homogenizing and essentialising is difficult to avoid. This is the case especially when my interviewees want to challenge the racializing notions that schools obtain and produce about Roma and Travellers: the interviewees produce counter narratives

about them which, however, cannot entirely avoid the logic of essentialising and homogenizing. At the same time, the interviewees emphasised the heterogeneity of Roma and Travellers. However, when they do this, many of the interviewees repeat the narrative of "some bad Roma" who are behind the racializing notions, a narrative of those Roma who give their people a bad name. This logic cannot challenge racialization either and, furthermore, it requires the interviewees to appear as "good Roma", tolerable Roma, as those who change the racializing imaginary about Roma by their own presence. This requirement further enforces the discourses of inadequacy/adequacy and tolerance through which Roma and Travellers become subjects in relation to what is perceived as adequate and the terms for becoming tolerated. I find that this conflict between homogeneity and heterogeneity describes the essence of how "knowledge about minoritised groups" as a proposed policy measure works as a way to enable an innocent position for other than those positioned in the minoritized groups. I suggest that the racializing notions about Roma and Travellers in schools function to make race a discursive category and to maintain racism as a system based on the category of race. The racializing notions are drawn from discursive cultural archives (Wekker 2014). I suggest that "knowledge about Roma and Travellers" does not constitute a policy measure which is able to tackle racialization and race as such, since it turns the focus onto the Roma and Travellers, and away from the structures.

I have, however, also mentioned that there is a silence in schools about Roma and Travellers (publication III) which my interviewees respond to with knowledge about them. This silence contributes to a narrative of Nordic countries as historically exceptionally homogenous countries (Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012; Keskinen et al. in press). This silence and the narratives of historical homogeneity marginalize Roma and Travellers in their societies. It also legitimizes the power position of the fictive homogenous majority which is connected to nation-state building (cf. Yuval-Davis 1997). Thus, silence about Roma and Travellers in schools maintains and legitimises the current power relations. I suggest that there is an unresolved paradox with the aim of providing knowledge about Roma and Travellers in that the silence marginalizes the groups but the knowledge cannot escape the logic of racialization. The interviewees negotiate with this paradox in their work. It is furthermore paradoxical that while there is a silence about Roma and Travellers, this exists alongside the repeated racialized remarks drawn from the discursive cultural archives. Thus, the interviewees challenge silence as well as the already "known" – the racializing notions where mostly negative signifiers such as criminality are attached to Roma. Either way, the relations of power are asymmetrical.

6.5 National minority-ness

When I started my research, my intention was to investigate the policies directed at national minority Roma and basic education. Thus one key criterion for including these particular three countries in my research was that they had granted national minority status to certain Roma groups. One of the initial ideas was that I could observe the kind of shape national minority-ness takes in basic education. It seems that in basic education policies national minority-ness is utilised to argue for including knowledge about the groups in the school contents. In the Swedish national core curriculum, for instance, it is stated that "The school is responsible for ensuring that each pupil on completing compulsory school has obtained knowledge about the cultures, languages, religion and history of the national minorities (Jews, Roma, indigenous Samis, Sweden Finns and Tornedalers)" (SNAE 2018, 12). In Finnish and Swedish educational legislation and curricula, this also means the right to learn Romani as a mother tongue. The Finnish and Swedish curricula have their own syllabi about the Romani language which emphasises the importance of protecting these cultures and languages (SNAE 2018; FNAE 2014).

The common nominator in all the policies for the shape of national minority-ness in basic education seems to be knowledge about these groups. There are already materials produced and distributed to schools (see Kålsas; also chapter 2.5 and 4). However, as I have described the paradoxes of the knowledge about the Other discourse, I would suggest elaboration of what this knowledge about national minorities should be, who generates this knowledge, and how this knowledge is used. In publication I, we also raise the concern that the narratives provided for schools may simplify and homogenise the histories and cultures of Roma and Travellers (see also Kalsås 2019). Furthermore, although it is often perceived as a common interest for the national minority groups to be seen in the school curriculum, there are actually diverse viewpoints on this. For instance, some of the Norwegian Travellers do not want there to be any extra material about them in schools (Høring oppfølging av Tater-/romaniutvalgets rapport, n.d.). Thus, the form national minority-ness takes in basic education is a political question: what kind of language and cultural rights are promoted through basic education, how national minorities are visible in the curricula and what it means to be positioned as majority or minority in basic education are all questions which constitute the majority/minority relations and positions in the society.

7 Discussion: Innocence, privilege and responsibility

In the course of this study, I have referred to those occasions on which I have been asked what should be done to promote the education of Roma and Travellers. I have written that I have found the question problematic since it makes multiple assumptions. So how would I answer the question now, in the light of my research? Could I answer?

As described throughout the study, various actions are taking place at the moment (Rajala & Blomerus 2015; Länsstyrelsen Stockholm 2018; Rodell Olgaç & Dimiter-Taikon 2016; Hagatun 2019a). Improvement in the school outcomes of Roma pupils have been reported. Meeting my Swedish and Norwegian interviewees for the second time in 2016, they described multiple advancements in their own localities. Mediator practice and mother tongue teaching in particular have received positive feedback (see Rodell Olgaç & Dimiter-Taikon 2016; Hagatun 2019a). Furthermore, in Finland and Sweden the national curricula have changed in the past few years and include their own syllabi for the Romani language (SNAE 2018; FNAE 2014). Many of my interviewees are at this very moment developing ways to promote the basic education of Roma and Travellers within their localities and are succeeding. Although my conclusions are critical of the current discourses and power relations, this does not mean that the work should not be done – quite the contrary. As the poststructural theories applied in this study suggest, power is productive and a variety of possibilities are activated at individual level even though the relations of power may be asymmetrical. Thus, this study does not suggest diminishing the successes reported or experienced. What this study does however point out is how the current practices still provide and constitute the same type of power relations and subjectivities as before. This study suggests that concentrating on challenging these power relations would open further opportunities for work which is already going on.

Huub van Baar (2012b, 1301) has claimed that in the internationalized Roma policies Roma-related issues have recently been perceived as "politically neutral" issues which just need to be fixed. I have argued that this depoliticization is also apparent in the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian policies on Roma, Travellers and basic education. Huub van Baar (2012b, 1300) calls for explicit articulation of the political nature of actors such as states, NGOs and IGOs in policy-making about the Roma. Turning to the question of the basic education of Roma and Travellers I would point out the ways problems become formulated in policy-making: what are represented as problems, how those problems are formulated, who are included in the process of formulation of the problems and in what terms. Instead of me, as a white academic researcher, dictating the direction, I would call for

more scope for various subjects and subjectivities within the policy-making and implementation processes. Thus, I would encourage more space for those multiple discussions which are already ongoing. I suggest that one step in that direction is articulating current discourses, power relations and subjectivities and elaborating them critically. Based on this research, I would suggest challenging the power relations of tolerance and any framework of inadequacy and non-belonging of minoritized groups.

Academic knowledge production is closely related to formulation of policies. Scholars and activists have criticised research on Roma, Travellers and education for ignoring societal power relations and for reproducing problematic descriptions of Roma and Travellers (e.g., Matache 2017a; Araujo 2016; Brüggemann 2014). Furthermore, scholars such as Ian Hancock (1997) have pointed out that a significant amount of research on the Roma re-uses faulty sources of information and stems from studies based on mythological perceptions of the Roma (see also Viljanen-Saira 1986; Pulma 2006). Romani studies have historically been guided by scientific racism, and those traces still affect research about the Roma, starting from the questions researchers pose (Acton 2016). Margareta Matache (2017a) claims that Romani studies today tend to renew whiteness as the norm and racialize the Roma (see also Vajda 2015; cf. Rorke 2014). The mostly white scholars define Roma(-ness) and impose identities on the Roma (see also Vajda 2015). Studies on Roma and Travellers are and have historically been closely linked to politics and policy-making (Pulma 2006; Palosuo 2008). A whole "minority research industry" (Essed & Nimako 2006; Nimako 2012) has emerged in Europe which makes it difficult to discern how the relations between politics, policies and scholarship are organised (Araujo 2014, 2). Rather than claiming that research may step beyond these relations, they should be scrutinized and made visible. We should examine critically how research is conducted and especially scrutinize how whiteness works within knowledge production. We should not repeat problematic notions and research settings. Intersectional analysis elaborating how multiple dimensions of difference such as social class, gender, age, sexuality or disability converge in the structures of racism and whiteness could be a means of finding openings for new questions and avoiding homogenizing Roma and Travellers through research practices (Kóczé 2009; Ahmed 2017). It is important for research to be critical about how it becomes research as a discursive practice (cf. Gunaratnam 2003). States, NGOs and IGOs are actors in Roma policies and the claims that are made are political, not neutral, as is not the use of research in policy-making either. In our knowledge production, I also suggest moving beyond methodological nationalism (Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2002). We should not produce nation-states as the "natural" unit of analysis and thus reproduce nation-states as primary contexts. As this study observes, the discourses are mobilized in global contexts. Thus, although we are talking about different countries and many different groups, we can see the

homologies which are constituted by internationalization, close collaboration between the Nordic countries and international governmental organisation and by shared histories. Simultaneously we should not overlook how nationalism plays out in Roma policies and global policies. Thus, moving beyond methodological nationalism would also involve scrutinizing how nationalism produces Roma policies and is produced in Roma policies.

All in all, this study comes down to innocence, privilege and responsibility. I would draw attention to the innocent subjectivity enabled by the current discourses for other than non-Roma/non-Travellers. Although other than Roma and Travellers are provided subjectivities as helpers and supporters, the need for change and making changes is largely placed on Roma and Travellers. I would like to draw a parallel from the work of promoting the education of Roma and Travellers to what Sara Ahmed (2012; 2017) calls "diversity work", in which it is often assumed that those who are perceived as making institutions diverse would be the ones who challenge and change discriminatory structures:

> Those of us who come to embody diversity for organisations are assumed to bring whiteness to an end by virtue of our arrival (Ahmed 2017, 5)

In writing about the responsibility and innocence of the privileged, I want to emphasise that "diversity work" should not be the responsibility of the minoritized groups. Additionally, we should not assume that when we have workers who identify as Roma or Travellers in schools, they would, as Sara Ahmed writes (2017), "bring whiteness to an end" simply by their presence. Those whose privileges are maintained through the current relations of power should actively and systematically deconstruct the unjust structures and whiteness.

Audre Lorde (1984, 114-115) has described how those whose privileges are maintained through discrimination ask those oppressed to teach them what they are doing wrong: "In other words, it is the responsibility of the oppressed to teach the oppressors their mistakes." Lorde claims that those in privileged positions thus bypass their responsibility in waiting for those oppressed to teach the oppressors. When I claim that "diversity work" or antiracism should not be the responsibility of Roma and Travellers, I do not state that Roma and Travellers should not work with these issues or that their contribution is not crucial. There is a long history of excluding Roma and Travellers from designing policies for them which should not be repeated (Bogdán et. al. 2015). What I would want to highlight, however, is that *all* the politics and policies also consider Roma and Travellers. Thus, I suggest moving further from a mind-set where those policies explicitly focusing on Roma and Travellers are understood as the only ones that do so. In order for Roma and Travellers to have the opportunity to participate in decision-making in all spheres of society, it should not be made their responsibility to end the current discrimination and racism against them.

References

Acton, Thomas A. (2016). Scientific racism, popular racism and the discourse of the Gypsy Lore Society. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(7), pp. 1187–1204. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2015.1105988.

Ahmed, Sara. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. London & New York: Routledge.

Ahmed, Sara. (2002). Racialized bodies. In Mary Evans & Ellie Lee, ed., *Real Bodies: A Sociological Introduction*. Hampshire/New York: Palgrave, pp. 46–63.

Ahmed, Sara. (2004). Declarations of Whiteness: The Non-Performativity of Anti-Racism. *borderlands e-journa*l, 3(2).

Ahmed, Sara. (2006). The Nonperformativity of Antiracism. *Meridians*, 7(1), pp. 104–126.

Ahmed, Sara. (2007). A Phenomenology of Whiteness. *Feminist Theory*, 8(2), pp. 149–168. DOI: 10.1177/1464700107078139

Ahmed, Sara. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, Sara. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

AID [Arbeids- og inkluderingsdepartementet], (2009). *Action plan for improvement of the living conditions of Roma in Oslo*. Oslo: The Ministry for Work and Inclusion. [pdf] Available at: https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/fad/vedlegg/sami/nasjmin/handlingsplan_rom_en.pdf [Accessed 20 June 2020]

Alexiadou, Nafsika. (2017). Equality and education policy in the European Union: An example from the case of Roma. In S. Parker, K. N. Gulson, & T. Gale, ed., *Policy and inequality in education: Volume 1. Series: Education policy and social inequality*, 1st edition. Singapore: Springer, pp. 111–131.

Alexiadou, N., & Norberg, A. (2017). Sweden's double decade for Roma inclusion: An examination of education policy in context. *European Education*, 49(1), pp. 36–55. doi:10.1080/10564934.2017.1280342

Anderson, Benedict. (1983). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London/New York: Verso.

Andreassen, Rikke & Ahmed-Adresen, Uzma. (2013). I can never be normal: a conversation about race, daily life practices, food and power. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 21(1), pp. 25–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506813507716.

Angervall, P. (2018) The academic career: a study of subjectivity, gender and movement among women university lecturers. *Gender and Education*, 30(1), pp. 105–118. doi: 10.1080/09540253.2016.1184234

Antigypsyism.eu (n.d.) [online] A reference paper on antigypsyism. A working definition of antigypsyism. Building an alliance against antigypsyism. Available at: https://www.antigypsyism.eu/ [Accessed 20 June 2020].

Araújo, Marta. (2016). A very 'prudent integration': white flight, school segregation and the depoliticization of (anti-)racism. *Race Ethnicity and Education,* 19(2), 300-323. doi:10.1080/13613324.2014.969225.

AMD [Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet] (2014) *Den mörka och okända historien Vitbok om övergrepp och kränkningar av romer under 1900-talet*. [online] Stockholm: Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet. Available at: https://www.regeringen.se/49baf8/contentassets/eaae9da200174a5faab2c8cd797936f1/den-morka-och-okanda-historien---vitbok-om-overgrepp-och-krankningar-av-romer-under-1900-talet-ds-20148 [Accessed 20 June 2020]

Bacchi, Carol. (1999). Women, Policy and Politics: The Construction of Policy Problems. SAGE Publications.

Bacchi, Carol. (2000). Policy as discourse: What does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 21(1), pp. 45–57. doi:10.1080/01596300050005493

Bacchi, Carol. (2009). *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson.

Bacchi, Carol. (2010). Poststructuralism, discourse and problematization: Implications for gender mainstreaming. *Kvinder, køn & forskning*, 4, pp. 62–72.

Bacchi, Carol. (2012). Why Study Problematizations? Making Politics Visible. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 2(1), pp. 1–8. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2012.21001

Bacchi, Carol & Bonham Jennifer. (2014). Reclaiming discursive practices as an analytic focus: Political implications. *Foucault Studies*, 17, pp. 173–192.

Bacchi, Carol & Bonham Jennifer. (2016). Appendix: Poststructural Interview Analysis. Politicizing "personhood". In Bacchi, Carol & Goodwin, Susan. *Poststructural policy analysis. A guide to practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 113–122.

Bacchi, Carol, & Goodwin, Susan. (2016). *Poststructural policy analysis: A guide to practice*. New York: Palgrave MAcmillan.

Ball, Stephen J. (1993). What Is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 13(2), pp. 10-17. DOI: 10.1080/0159630930130203.

Ball, Stephen J. (2015) What is policy? 21 years later: reflections on the possibilities of policy research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural*

Politics of Education, 36(3), pp. 306–313. DOI: 10.1080/01596306.2015.1015279

Banton, Michael (2015) John Rex's main mistake. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(8), pp. 1369-1381. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2015.1016056.

Barnombudsmannen (2005). *"De vill att jag ska vara osynlig" Romska barn och ungdomar berättar om sin vardag*. [online] Stockholm: Barnombudsmannen. Available at: https://www.barnombudsmannen.se/globalassets/systemimporter/publikationer2/romska-barn-2005.pdf [Accessed 20 June 2020]

Barot, Rohit & Bird, John (2001) Racialization: the genealogy and critique of a concept. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), pp. 601–618. DOI: 10.1080/01419870120049806.

Bayati, Zahra. 2014. "Den Andre" I lärarutbildningen – en studi om den rasifierande svenska studentens villkor i globaliseringens tid. PhD. University of Gothenburg.

Bijvoet, Ellen & Fraurud, Kari. (2007). *Det romska språket och romsk språkvård i Sverige* [online] Available at: https://www.sprakochfolkminnen.se/download/18.4aec91b214565240e191055/1398688312019/Det+romska+sprC3A5ket+och+romsk+sprC3A5kvC3A5rd+i+Sverige+2007.pdf [Accessed 20 June 2020]

Björkman, Maria & Widmalm, Sven. 2010. Selling Eugenics: The Case of Sweden. *Notes and Records of the Royal Society* 64, pp. 379–400 doi:10.1098/rsnr.2010.0009

Boatcă, M., Costa, S. & Gutiérrez Rodrigues, E. (2010) Introduction: Decolonizing European Sociology: Different Patgs towards a Pending Project. In Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E., Boatcă, M. & Costa S., ed., *Decolonizing European Sociology*. *Transdisciplinary approaches*. 1st ed. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 1–12.

Bogdán, Mária, Ryder, Andrew & Taba, Marius. (2015). The Roma Spring: Knowledge Production and the Search for a New Humanity. *Roma Rights Journal Of The European Roma Rights Centre*, 2, pp. 33–38.

Bogdán, Mária, Dunajeva, Jekatyerina, Junghaus, Tímea, Kóczé, Angéla, Rövid, Márton, Rostas¸ Iulius, Ryder, Andrew, Szilvási, Marek & Taba, Marius. (2015) Introduction: Nothing About Us Without Us? *Roma Rights Journal Of The European Roma Rights Centre*, 2, pp. 3–6.

Bové, Paul A. (1990). Discourse. In F. Lentricchia & T. McLaughlin, ed., *Critical terms for literary study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 50–65.

Bray, Mark, Adamson, Bob & Mason, Mark. (2007). Different models, different emphases, different insights. In Mark Bray, Bob Adamson & Mark Mason, ed., *Comparative Education Research. Approaches and*

Methods. Second edition. Cham Heidelberg New York Dodrecht London: Springer, pp. 417–436.

Braidotti, Rosi. (2010). Nomadism: against methodological nationalism. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(3&4), 408–418.

Brearley, M. (2001). The persecution of Gypsies in Europe. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45 (4), pp. 588–599. doi: 10.1177/00027640121957367

Brinkmann, Svend. (2018). The Interview. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln, ed., *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Fifth Edition. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, pp. 569–599.

Britzman, D. P. 2000. "The Question of Belief": Writing Poststructural Ethnography. In Wanda Pillow & Elisabeth Adams St. Pierre, ed., *Working the Ruins: Feminst Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education*, 1st ed. New York: Routledge, pp. 27– 40.

Broberg, Gunnar and Roll-Hansen, Nils. 2005. Preface to the 2005 Edition. In Gunnar Broberg & Nils Roll-Hansen (eds.) *Eugenics and the Welfare State : Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland*, 2nd ed. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, pp. ix – xviii.

Brown, Wendy. (1998). Genealogical politics. In Jeremy Moss, ed., *The later Foucault: Politics and philosophy*, London: Sage, pp. 33–49.

Brown, W. (2006). *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brüggemann, C. (2014) Romani culture and academic success: arguments against the belief in a contradiction. *Intercultural Education*, 25:6, pp. 439-452, DOI: 10.1080/14675986.2014.990229

Bunescu, Ilana (2014). *Roma in Europe : The Politics of Collective Identity Formation*. Farnham/ Surrey: Routledge.

Butler, Judith. (1995). For a Careful Reading. In Seyla Benhabib, Judith Butler, Drucilla Cornell and Nancy Fraser, ed., *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange*, New York: Routledge, pp. 127–143.

Butler, Judith. (1997a). *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Butler, Judith. (1997b). *Excitable speech: a politics of the performative*. New York & London: Routledge.

Castaneda, Anu, Erhola, Kaaren, Kuusio, Hammamaria, Weiste-Paakkanen, Anneli & Lämsä, Riikka. (2018). Syrjintä ja turvallisuus. In Anneli Weiste-Paakkanen, Riikka Lämsä & Hannamaria Kuusio, ed., *Suomen romaniväestön osallisuus ja hyvinvointi. Romanien hyvinvointitutkimus Roosan perustulokset 2017–2018*. [online] Helsinki: Terveyden ja hyvinvoinnin laitos. Available at: http://www.julkari.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/137276/RAP2018_15_S

uomen%20romaniv%C3%A4est%C3%B6_web%20%282%29.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y [Accessed 22 June 2020]

Chadderton, Charlotte. (2018). *Judith Butler, Race & Education*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. (1989) Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *1*(8).

CoE [Council of Europe] ETS No. 148. (n.d.). European charter for regional or minority languages. Available at: http://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/text-of-the-charter [Accessed 20 June 2020]

CoE [Council of Europe] Treaty 157. (n.d.). Framework convention for the protection of national minorities. Available at: http://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/text-of-the-convention [Accessed 22 June 2020]

CoE [Council of Europe]. (2000). Recommendation No R (2000) 4 of the committee of ministers to member states on the education of Roma/Gypsy children in Europe. Available at: https://rm.coe.int/09000016805e2e91 [Accessed: 22 June 2020]

CoE [Council of Europe]. (2010). The Strasbourg declaration on Roma. Available at: https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805ce1de [Accessed 22 June 2020]

CoE [Council of Europe]. (2012). *Council of Europe Descriptive Glossary of terms relating to Roma issues version dated 18 May 2012* [online] Availble at: http://a.cs.coe.int/team20/cahrom/documents/Glossary%20Roma%20EN%20version%2018%20May%202012.pdf [Accessed 22 June 2020]

CoE [Council of Europe]. (2016). Thematic action plan on the inclusion of Roma and Travellers 2016–2019. Available at: https://rm.coe.int/1680684b5e [accessed 20 June 2020]

CoE [Council of Europe]: *Roma and Travellers*. Available at: https://www.coe.int/en/web/roma-and-travellers [Accessed 22 June 2020]

Coffey, Amanda & Atkinson, Paul. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Collins, Patricia Hill. (2000a). What's Going On? Black Feminist Thought and the Politics of Postmodernism. In E. St. Pierre & W. Pillow, ed., *Working the ruins: feminist poststructural theory and methods in education*. 1st ed. New Your; London: Routledge, pp. 41–73.

Collins, Patricia Hill. (2000b). *Black Feminist Thought. Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Second Edition. London: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia Hill. (2004). Learning from the Outsider within: the sociological significance of black feminist thought. In Sandra Harding (ed.) *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader. Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York & London: Routledge, pp. 103–126.

Corradi, Laura. (2018). *Gypsy Feminism: Intersectional Politics, Alliances, Gender and Queer Activism*. Oxfordshire & New York: Routledge.

Davies, Bronwyn. (1993). *Shards of Glass: Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities*. Creskill: Hampton Press.

Davies, Bronwyn. (1997). The Subject of Poststructuralism: A Reply to Alison Jones. *Gender and Education*, 9(3), pp. 271-283. DOI:10.1080/09540259721259.

Davies, Bronwyn. (2004). Introduction: Poststructuralist Lines of Flight in Australia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(1), pp. 3–9.

Davies, Bronwyn. (2006). "Subjectification: The Relevance of Butler's Analysis for Education." *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(4), pp. 425–438. doi:10.1080/01425690600802907

Davies, Tony. (1996). *Humanism*. London: Routledge.

Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities 1992 (resolution 47/135) adopted 18 December 1992

Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonne. (2018). Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln, ed., *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 5th edition, Los Angeles: SAGE Publications pp. 1–26.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1897/2015). The Conservation of Races (1987). In Nahum Dimitri Chandler, ed., WEB Du Bois The Problem of the Color Line at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: The Essential Early Essays, Fordham University, pp. 51–66.

Du Bois, W.E.B (1940/2007) *Dusk of Dawn* (The Oxford W.E.B. Du Bois) New York: Oxford University Press.

Duncombe, Jean & Jossip, Julie. (2012). 'Doing Rapport' and the Ethics of 'Faking Friendship'. In Tina Miller, Maxine Birch, Melanie Mauthner & Julie Jessop, ed., *Ethics in Qualitative Research*, 2nd edition, London: SAGE, pp. 108–121.

Eide, E. (2010). Strategic Essentialism and Ethnification. Hand in Glove? *Nordicom Review,* 31(2), pp. 63-78.

Engebrigtsen, A. I. (2015). Educating the Roma: The struggle for cultural autonomy in a seminomadic group in Norway. *Social Inclusion*, 3(5), pp. 115–125. doi:10.17645/si.v3i5.275

Erickson, Frederick. (2018). Qualitative Methods: Histories in Social and Educational Research. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln, ed., *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 5th edition, Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, pp. 36–65.

Essed, Philomena & Nimako, Kwame. (2006). Designs and (Co)Incidents: Cultures of Scholarship and Public Policy on Immigrants/Minorities in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 47(3–4), pp. 281–312. DOI: 10.1177/0020715206065784.

European Commission. (2011). *An EU framework for national Roma integration strategies up to 2020: Communication from the commission to the European parliament, the council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions* Brussels: Commission of the European Communities. [online] Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52011DC0173 [accessed 22 June 2020]

European Union. (2012). *Roma and education: Challenges and opportunities in the European Union*. [online] Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union. Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/6df1491e-5d12-4b7e-beb5-ef1c896a0438 [Accessed 22 June 2020]

European Parliament. (2019). *European Parliament resolution of 12 February 2019 on the need for a strengthened post-2020 Strategic EU Framework for National Roma Inclusion Strategies and stepping up the fight against anti-Gypsyism (2019/2509(RSP))* [online] Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P8-TA-2019-0075&language=EN&ring=B8-2019-0098 [accessed 22 June 2020]

Faist, Thomas. (2012). Toward a Transnational Methodology: Methods to Address Methodological Nationalism, Essentialism, and Positionality. *revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, 28(1), pp. 51–70.

Fanon, Franz. (2003). *Sorron yöstä*. Translated by Hilkka Mäki. Helsinki: LIKE.

Finnish goverment decree 2003, *Valtioneuvoston asetus valtakunnallisesta romaniasiain neuvottelukunnasta ja alueellisista romaniasiain neuvottelukunnista* 1019/2003

FNAE [Finnish National Agency for Education]. (2014). *Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014*. [online] Available at:

https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2014.pdf [accessed 22 June 2020]

FNAE [Finnish National Agency for Education]. (2010). Romanilapsen kohtaaminen esi- ja perusopetuksessa. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge, and the discourses on language*. (R. Sawyer, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. (translated by Robert Hurley) NewYork: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980) Two Lectures. In Colin Gordon, ed., *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972 – 1977 Michel Foucault*. 1st ed. New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 78–108.

Foucault, Michel. (1983). Afterword: The Subject and Power. In Hubert L. Dreyfus & Paul Rabinow, ed., *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2nd ed., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 208–226.

Foucault, Michel. (1988) The Concern for Truth. In Lawrence D. Kritzman, ed., *Foucault: Politics, Philosophy and Culture. Interviews and other writings 1977–1984*. London: Routledge,1st ed., pp. 255–270.

Foucault, M. (1991). Politics and the study of discourse. In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, Peter Miller, ed., *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press , pp. 53–72.

Foucault, M. (1997a). The ethics of concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow, ed., *Michel Foucault Ethics: Subjectivity and truth*. *The essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984*. 1st ed., New York: New Press, pp. 281–301.

Foucault, Michel. (1997b). Polemics, Politics and Problematizations: Michel Foucault – Interview. In P. Rabinow. ed., *Michel Foucault Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. *The essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984*. 1st ed., New York: New Press, pp. 111–120.

From, Tuuli & Sahlström, Fritjof. (2016). Shared places, separate spaces: constructing cultural spaces through two national languages in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 61(4), pp. 465-478, DOI: 10.1080/00313831.2016.1147074

FRA [European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights]. (2019). *Roma*. [online] Available at: https://fra.europa.eu/en/theme/roma [Accessed 22 June 2020]

FRA [European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights]. (2016). *Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. Roma – Selected Findings*. [online] Luxembourg Available at: https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/eumidis-ii-roma-selected-findings [accessed 20 June 2020].

Friman-Korpela, Sarita. (2014). *Romanipolitiikasta romanien politiikkaan. Poliittisen asialistan ja toimijakonseption muutos 1900-luvun jälkipuoliskon Suomessa.* PhD. University of Jyväskylä.

Fylkesnes, Sandra. (2019) Patterns of racialised discourses in Norwegian teacher education policy: Whiteness as a pedagogy of amnesia in the national curriculum. Journal of Education Policy, 34(3), pp. 394-422. DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2018.1482503.

Gilroy, Paul (1998) Race ends here. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(5), pp. 838–847, DOI: 10.1080/014198798329676.

Goldberg, D. T. (2004). The Power of Tolerance. In T. Kushner and N. Alman, ed., *Philosemitism, Antisemitism and 'The Jews': Perspectives from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, Alderswoth: Ashgate, pp. 31–48.

Goldberg, David Theo. (2006). Racial Europeanization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 29(2), pp 331–364. DOI: 10.1080/01419870500465611.

Goldberg, David Theo. (2015). *Are we postracial yet?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gooding-Williams, Robert. (2018). W.E.B. Du Bois, In Edward N. Zalta, ed., *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2018 Edition), Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/dubois/ [accessed 22 June 2020]

Gordon, T., Holland, J. & Lahelma, E. (2000) *Making spaces. Citizenship and difference in schools*. Wiltshire: McMillan Press Ltd.

Gorski, P. (2016) Rethinking the Role of "Culture" in Educational Equity: From Cultural Competence to Equity Literacy. *Multicultural Perspectives* 18(4), pp. 221-226., DOI: 10.1080/15210960.2016.1228344

Government.no, (2015) International Roma Day, 8 April 2015 [online] Available at: https://www.regjeringen.no/en/aktuelt/den-internasjonale-romdagen/id2404809/ [Accessed 22 June 2020].

Greiner, Clemens & Sakdapolrak, Patrik. (2013). Translocality: Concepts, Applications and Emerging Research Perspectives. *Geography Compass* 7(5), pp. 373–384. doi: 10.1111/gec3.12048.

Gunaratnam, Yasmin. (2003). *Researching Race and Ethnicity*. London: SAGE Publications.

Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, Encarnación. (2010). Decolonizing Postcolonial Rhetoric. In Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Manuela Boatcă and Sérgio Costa, ed., *Decolonizing European Sociology: Transdisciplinary Approaches.* Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 49–70.

Haave, Per. (2000). Sterilisering av tatere – kirurgi på "rasemessig" grunnlag? In Bjørn Hvinden (ed.) *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget. pp. 32–65.

Hagatun, K. (2019a). The Educational Situation for Roma in Norway. A country study. . In A. Óhidy & K. R. Forray , ed., *Lifelong Learning and the*

Roma Minority in Western and Southern Europe. UK: Emerald publishing. (pp. 91-112)

Hagatun, K. (2019b). "They assume that I don't really want education for my children": Roma mothers' experiences with the Norwegian educational system. *HERJ Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, 9(1), pp. 9–21. doi:10.1556/063.9.2019.1.2

Hage, Ghassan. (2000). *White Nation: Fantasies of White supremacy in a multicultural society*. New York: Routledge & Annendale: Pluto Press.

Hakala, K. (2007) *Paremmin tietäjän paikka ja toisin tietämisen tila. Opettajuus (ja tutkijuus) pedagogisena suhteena*. PhD. University of Helsinki.

Hall, Stuart. 1999. *Identiteetti*. Vastapaino: Tampere

Hall, S. 2000. Conclusion: the Multi-cultural Question. In Barnor Hesse, ed., *Un/settled Multiculturalisms. Diasporas, Entanglments, Transruptions*. London/New York: Zed Books, pp. 209 – 241.

Hancock, Ian. (1991). The East European roots of Romani nationalism. *Nationalities Papers*, 19(3), pp. 251-267, DOI: 10.1080/00905999108408203

Hancock, Ian. (1997). Duty and beauty, posession and truth: The claim of lexical impoverishment as control. In T.A. Acton and A. Mundy, ed., *Romani culture and Gypsy identity*, Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, pp. 180–7.

Hannikainen, Lauri. (1996). The Status of Minorities, Indigenous Peoples and Immigrant and Refugee Groups in Four Nordic States. *Nordic Journal of International Law*, 65, pp. 1-71.

Haraway, Donna. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), pp. 575–599.

Harding, Sandra. (2004). Introduction: Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political, Philosophic, and Scientific Debate. In Sandra Harding, ed., *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader. Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York & London: Routledge, pp. 1–16.

Harding, Sandra. (2005). Negotiating with the Positivist Legacy: New Social Justice Movements and a Standpoint Politics of Method. In George Steinmetz, ed., *The politics of method in the human sciences: Positivism and its epistemological others*. Durham/London: Duke university press, pp. 346 – 365.

Hasvoll, Balder C. (2015). Sigøynerkontoret. In *Ute er det kaldt: om romer i Norge*. Oslo: Tiltaket for Rom. pp. 65–74.

Hedman, Henry. 2009. Suomen romanikieli: Sen asema yhteisössään, käyttö ja romanien kieliasenteet. [online] Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus. Available at:

http://scripta.kotus.fi/www/verkkojulkaisut/julk8/Suomen_romanikieli.pdf [Accessed 22 June 2020]

Hedman, Henry. (2015). Suomen romanikielen asemaan ja säilymiseen vaikuttavia tekijöitä. In Mari Huhtanen & Mika Puukko, ed., *Romanikielen asema, opetus ja osaaminen: Romanikielen oppimistulokset perusopetuksen 7.-9. vuosiluokilla 2015*. Tampere: Kansallinen koulutuksen arviointikeskus, pp. 21–37.

Hekman, Susan. (1997). Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited. *Signs*, 22(2), pp. 341–365.

Helakorpi, Jenni. (2013). *"Työntekijä työntekijöiden joukossa, mutta…" Erojen jäsennyksiä romanitaustaisten koulunkäyntiavustajien puheessa*. Master's Thesis. University of Helsinki.

Helakorpi, Jenni, Mietola, Reetta & Niemi, Anna-Maija. (2014). Producing data, accessing knowledge: building relations during ethnographic fieldwork, unpublished conference paper, ECER.

Held, David (2003) The changing structure of international law: sovereignty transformed? In: David Held and Anthony McGrew, ed., *The Global Transformations Reader: an Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. 2nd ed. Cambridge/Malden: Polity Press, pp. 162-176.

Herakova, L. L. (2009). Identity, communication, inclusion: The Roma and (new) Europe. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 2(4), pp. 279–297. doi:10.1080/17513050903177318

Heyl, B.S. (2001). Ethnographic Interviewing. In P. Atkinson, C. S. Delamont, L.Lofland, and J. Lofland, ed., *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage, pp. 369–383.

Hietala, Marjatta. (2005). From Race Hygiene to Sterilization: The Eugenics Movement in Finland. In Gunnar Broberg & Nils Roll-Hansen, ed., *Eugenics and the Welfare State : Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland*, 2nd edition, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, pp. 195–258.

Hietala, Marjatta. (2009). Eugeniikan ja rotuhygienian taustat ja seuraukset. *Tieteessä tapahtuu*. 8/2009, pp. 14–19.

Hinton-Smith, Tamsin, Danvers, Emily & Jovanovic, Tanja. (2017). Roma women's higher education participation: whose responsibility? *Gender and Education*, DOI: 10.1080/09540253.2016.1274386

hooks, b. (2015). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. 3rd edition. New York: Routledge.

hooks, b. (1981) *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. South End Press.

Høring - oppfølging av Tater-/romaniutvalgets rapport. (n.d.). [Hearing – follow-up for Traveller committee report]Available at: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/horing---oppfolging-av-tater-romaniutvalgetsrapport/id2464464/ [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Huttunen, Laura & Riikka Homanen. (2017). Etnografinen haastattelu. In Matti Hyvärinen, Pirjo, Nikander & Johanna Ruusuvuori,, ed., *Tutkimushaastattelun käsikirja*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Hübinette, Tobias. (2017). Förord. In Tobias, Hübinette, ed., *Ras och vithet*: *Svenska rasrelationer igår och i dag*. 1st ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur. 9–24.

Hübinette, Tobias. (2012) 'Words that wound': Swedish whiteness and its inability to accommodate minority experiences. In Lars Jensen & Kristín Loftsdóttir, ed., *Whiteness and postcolonialism in the Nordic countries: Exceptionalism, migrant others and national identities*, 1st ed., Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 43-56.

Hübinette, Tobias & Lundstöm, Catrin. (2014). Three phases of hegemonic whiteness: understanding racial temporalities in Sweden. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 20(6), pp. 423–437. DOI: 10.1080/13504630.2015.1004827.

International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination 1965 (resolution 2106) Adopted and opened for signature and ratification 21 December 1965, entry into force 4 January 1969.

Ikävalko, Elina. (2016) *Vaikenemisia ja vastarintaa. Valtasuhteet ja toiminnan mahdollisuudet oppilaitosten tasa-arvosuunnittelussa*. PhD. University of Helsinki.

Ikävalko, Elina & Kantola, Johanna. (2017). Feminist resistance and resistance to feminism in gender equality planning in Finland. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 24(3), 233–248.

Izsák, R. (2015). Comprehensive Study of the Human Rights Situation of Roma Worldwide, With a Particular Focus on the Phenomenon of Anti-Gypsyism, Report to the Human Rights Council. [online] United Nations. Available at: http://imadr.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/A_HRC_29_24_E_Comprehensive-study-of-the-human-rights-situation-of-Roma-worldwide-with-a-particular-focus-on-the-phenomenon.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Jackson, Alecia Y. & Mazzei, Lisa A. (2012). *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research: viewing data across multiple perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Jones, Alison. (1997). Teaching Post-structuralist Feminist Theory in Education: student resistance. *Gender and Education*, 9(3) , pp. 261–269.

Junkala, Pekka & Tawah, Sanna (2009). *Enemmän samanlaisia kuin erilaisia: Romanilasten ja nuorten hyvinvointi ja heidän oikeuksiensa toteutuminen Suomessa*. [online] Jyväskylä: Lapsiasiainvaltuutetun toimiston julkaisuja. Available at: http://lapsiasia.fi/wp-

content/uploads/2015/04/romanilasten-hyvinvointi.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Juva, Ina & Holm, Gunilla. (2017). Not All Students are equally equal: Normality as Finnishness. In Kari Kantaisalmi & Gunilla Holm, ed., *The State, Schooling, and Identity: Diversifying Education in Europe,* 1st ed, Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 213-232

Kalsås, Vidar Fagerheim. (2019). *Forteljingar om eigenart og undertrykking. Ein studie av undervisningstekstar om minoritetane romanifolket og romar*. PhD. University of Agder.

Kauppila, Aarno, Mietola, Reetta & Niemi, Anna-Maija. 2018. Koulutususkon rajoilla: koulutuksen julma lupaus kehitys- ja vaikeavammaisille opiskelijoille. In Heikki Silvennoinen, Mira Kalalahti, & Janne Varjo, ed., *Koulutuksen lupaukset ja koulutususko: kasvatussosiologian vuosikirja*. Helsinki: FERA Suomen kasvatustieteellinen seura, pp. 209-240.

Kennedy, Patricia and Smith, Karen. (2018). The hope of a better life? Exploring the challenges faced by migrant Roma families in Ireland in relation to children's education. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1471344

Keskinen, Suvi & Andreassen, Rikke. (2017) Developing theoretical perspectives on racialization and migration. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 7 (2), pp. 64–69.

Keskinen, Suvi, Alemanji, Aminkeng Atabong, Himanen, Markus, Kivijärvi, Antti., Osazee, Uyi, Pöyhölä, Nirosha, and Rousku, Venla. (2018). *The stopped—ethnic profiling in Finland*. [online] Helsinki: Swedish School of Social Science. Available at: https://www.helsinki.fi/sites/default/files/atoms/files/notat118en.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Keskinen, Suvi, Skaptadóttir, Unnur Dís & Toivanen, Mari. (2019). Narrations of homogeneity, waning welfare states, and the politics of solidarity. In Keskinen S., Skaptadottir U. D. & Toivanen, M., ed., *Undoing Homogeneity: Migration, Difference and the Politics of Solidarity*. Oxon& New York: Routledge, pp. 1–17.

Kóczé, Angéla (2018) Race, migration and neoliberalism: distorted notions of Romani migration in European public discourses. *Social Identities*, 24(4), pp. 459-473, DOI: 10.1080/13504630.2017.1335827

Kóczé, Angéla. & Rövid, Marton. (2012). Pro-Roma Civil Society: Acting For, with or Instead of Roma? In Sabine, Selchow, Mary, Kaldor & Henrietta L. Moore, ed., *Global Civil Society. Ten Years of Critical Reflection.* Gordonsville: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 110–122.

Kóczé, Angéla. (2009). *Missing intersectionality. Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Class in Current Research and Policies on Romani Women in Europe*. Budapest: Center for policy studies Central European University.

Kommissionen mot antiziganism. (2015a). *Registrering av romer*. [online] Stockholm: Kommissionen mot antiziganism. Available at: http://www.minoritet.se/user/motantiziganism/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Registrering-av-romer.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Kommissionen mot antiziganism. (2015b). *Antiziganism i Sverige: Om övergrepp och kränkningar av romer under 1900-talet och i dag*. [online] Stockholm: Kommissionen mot antiziganism. Available at: http://motantiziganism.se/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Antiziganismen-i-Sverige.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Koski, Leena. (2011). Teksteistä teemoiksi. In Anu Puusa & Pauli Juuti, ed., *Menetelmäviidakon raivaajat. Perusteita laadullisen tutkimuslähestymistavan valintaan*. Vantaa: JTO, pp. 126–149.

Kumashiro, Kevin. (2002). Troubling education. Queer activism and anti-oppressive pedagogy. New York & London: Routledge Falmer.

Kurki, Tuuli. (2019). *Immigrant-ness as (mis)fortune?: Immigrantisation through integration policies and practices in education*. PhD. University of Helsinki.

Kymlicka, Will. (2007). The internationalization of minority rights. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 6(1), pp. 1–32. doi: 10.1093/icon/mom032

Kyuchukov, Hristo. (2012). Roma Mediators in Europe: A New Council of Europe Programme. Intercultural Education 23 (4), pp. 375–378. doi:10.1080/14675986.2012.724875

Kyuchukov, Hristo. (ed.) (2012). New faces of antigypsyism in modern Europe. [online] Prague. Available at: http://jaroslavbalvin.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/AG_04.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. (1998) Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), pp. 7–24. DOI: 10.1080/095183998236863

Lahelma, Elina. (2005). School grades and other resources: The “failing boys” discourse revisited, *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(2), pp. 78-89.

Lappalainen, S., Lahelma, E. & Mietola, R. (2015). Problematizing evaluative categorisations: collaborative and multisited interpretations of constructions of normality in Estonia and Finland. In P. Smeyers, D. Bridgges, N. C. Burbules, & M. Griffiths, ed., *International Handbook of*

Interpretation in Educational Research. Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media, pp. 843–864.

Lappalainen, Sirpa. (2006) *Kansallisuus, etnisyys ja sukupuoli lasten välisissä suhteissa ja esiopetuksen käytännöissä*. PhD. University of Helsinki.

Lather, Patti. (1997). Drawing the line at angels : working the ruins of feminist ethnography. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 10(3), 285–304.

Lather, Patti. (2007). *Getting lost: feminist efforts toward a double(d) science*. State University of New York Press.

Lehtonen, Jukka. (2017). Troubling normativities? Constructing sexual and gender diversity in the educational work of Finnish LGBTI human rights association SETA. In T. Vaahtera, A-M, Niemi, S. Lappalainen & D. Beach, ed., *Troubling educational cultures in the Nordic countries*, 1 ed., London: Tufnell press, pp. 117-139

Lentin, Alana. (2004). *Racism and anti-racism in Europe*. London: Pluto Press.

Lentin, Alana. (2005). Replacing 'race', historicizing 'culture' in multiculturalism, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 39(4), pp. 379-396.

Lentin, Alana. (2008). *Racism. A Beginner's guide*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Liljeström, Marianne. (2004). Feministinen metodologia. Mitä se on? In Marianne Liljeström, ed., *Feministinen tietäminen: Keskustelua metodologiasta*. Tampere: Vastapaino, pp. 9–22.

Lindblad, Sverker & Popkewitz, Thomas S. (2003). Comparative ethnography: fabricating the new millennium and its exclusions. In Beach, Dennis, Gordon, Tuula & Lahelma, Elina. *Democratic education. Ethnographic challenges*. London: Tufnell press, pp. 10–14.

Lofsdóttir, K. & Jensen, L. (2012). Introduction: Nordic Exceptionalism and the Nordic 'Others'. In K. Lofsdóttir & L. Jensen, ed., *Whiteness and Postcolonialism in the Nordic Region*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 1–11.

Lorde, Audre. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and speeches*. Berkeley: Crossing Press.

Lund, Anne Bonnevie. (2010). A study on how the use of ICT in travelling periods influences Romani students' attitudes towards school. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 26, pp. 19–29.

Lund, Anne Bonnevie & Moen, Bente Bolme. (2013) Taterne og skolen – hva må til for å bedre taterbarnas skolesituasjon? *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift* 97(4-5), pp. 259–268.

Lundström, Catrin & Teitelbaum, Benjamin R. (2017). Nordic Whiteness: An Introduction. *Scandinavian Studies*, 89(2), pp. 151–158.

Länsstyrelsen Stockholm. (2018). *Romsk inkludering lokalt – nuläget i kommuner med statligt stöd 2012–2017.* [online] Stockholm: Länsstyrelsen Stockholm. Available at: https://www.lansstyrelsen.se/stockholm/tjanster/publikationer/2018/r

omsk-inkludering-lokalt---nulaget-i-kommuner-med-statligt-stod-2012-2017.html [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Marcus, George E. & Fischer, Michael M. (1986). *Anthropology as cultural critique: an experimental moment in the human sciences.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Markkanen, Airi. (2003). *Luonnollisesti: Etnografinen tutkimus romaninaisten elämänkulusta*. PhD. University of Joensuu.

Mattila, Markku. (1999). *Kansamme parhaaksi. Rotuhygienia Suomessa vuoden 1935 sterilointilakiin asti.* PhD. Jyväskylä: Gummerus Kirjapaino oy.

Mattila, Markku. (2003). Rotuhygienia ja kansalaisuus. In Ilpo Helén & Mikko Jauho (eds.) *Kansalaisuus ja kansanterveys*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, pp. 110–127.

Mattila, Markku. (2005). Sterilointipolitiikka ja romanit Suomessa vuosina 1950–1970. Antti Häkkinen, Panu Pulma & Miika Tervonen ,ed., *Vieraat kulkijat – Tutut talot: Näkökulmia etnisyyden ja köyhyyden historian Suomessa*. Helsinki: SKS, pp. 407–410.

Mason, Mark. (2007). Comparing Cultures. In Mark Bray, Bob Adamson & Mark Mason, ed., *Comparative Education Research. Approaches and Methods*. Second edition. Cham Heidelberg New York Dodrecht London: Springer, pp. 221–258.

Massey, Doreen. (2005). *For Space*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Matache, Margareta. (2017a). *Dear Gadjo (non-Romani) Scholars…* [Blog] Harvardfxb Center for Health and Human Rights. Available at: https://fxb.harvard.edu/2017/06/19/dear-gadje-non-romani-scholars/ [accessed 23 June 2020]

Matache, Margareta. (2017b). Biased Elites, Unfit Policies: Reflections on the Lacunae of Roma Integration Strategies. *European Review*, 25(4), pp. 588–607.

Matras, Yaron. (2013). Scholarship and the Politics of Romani Identity: Strategic and Conceptual Issues. In S., Spiliopoulou Åkermark, A. Bloed, R. Hofmann, T.H. Malloy, J., Marko, J., Packer, Weller, M., ed., *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* Vol. 10, Leiden, Boston: BRILL/Martinus Nijhoff, pp. 209-245.

McHoul, Alec & Grace, Wendy. (1993). *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, power and subject*. University College London Press.

MFAF [Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland] (2019) *The Fifth Periodic Report by the Government of Finland 2019* [online] Availble at: https://um.fi/euroopan-neuvoston-voimassa-olevat-ihmisoikeussopimukset/-/asset_publisher/7eBEhF08kjVG/content/kansallisten-vahemmistojen-suojelua-koskeva-puiteyleissopimus-1995- [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Mietola, Reetta. (2007). Etnografisesta haastattelusta etnografiseen analyysiin. In Sirpa Lappalainen, Pirkko Hynninen, Tarja Kankkunen, Elina Lahelma & Tarja Tolonen, ed., *Etnografia metodologiana: Lähtökohtana koulutuksen tutkimus*. Tampere: Vastapaino, pp. 151–177.

Mietola, Reetta. (2014). *Hankala erityisyys: Etnografinen tutkimus erityisopetuksen käytännöistä ja erityisyyden muotoutumisesta yläkoulun arjessa*. PhD. Unversity of Helsinki.

Miles, Robert. (1989). *Racism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Miles, Robert. (1993). *Racism after 'race relations'*. London and New York: Routledge.

Mirga-Kruszelnicka, Anna. 2015. Romani Studies and emerging Romani scholarship *Roma Rights Journal Of The European Roma Rights Centre*, 2, pp. 39–46.

Mirga, Andrzej. 2018. Mihai Surdu, Those Who Count: Expert Practices of Roma Classification. Book review. *Critical Romani Studies*, 1(1), pp. 114–126, DOI: 10.29098/crs.v1i1.14.

Miskovic, Maja. (2009). Roma Education in Europe: In Support of the Discourse of Race. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society* 17 (2), pp. 201–220. doi:10.1080/14681360902934442.

Mitchell, David & Snyder, Sharon. (2003). The Eugenic Atlantic: race, disability and the making of an international Eugenic science, 1800–1945, *Disability & Society*, 18(7), 843 – 864, DOI: 10.1080/0968759032000127281

Molina, Irene. (2005). Rasifiering Ett teoretiskt perspektiv i analysen av diskriminering i Sverige. In Paulina de los Reyes & Masoud Kamali, ed., *Bortom Vi och Dom Teoretiska reflektioner om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering* [online] Stockholm: Statens offentliga utredningar, pp. 95–112. Available at: http://www.temaasyl.se/Documents/Offentliga%20utredningar%20och%20rapporter%20(sv)/SOU%202005_41a.pdf [accessed 23 June 2020]

Montesino Parra, Norma. (2002). Zigenarfrågan: Intervention och romantik. PhD. Lunds Universitet.

Montesino, Norma & Ohlsson Al Fakir, Ida. 2015. The Prolonged Inclusion of Roma Groups in Swedish Society. *Social Inclusion* 3(5), pp. 126–136 doi: 10.17645/si.v3i5.247

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. (1984). Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourse. *boundary 2,* 12(3), pp. 333–358.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade (2003). "Under Western Eyes" Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles. *Signs,* 28(2), pp. 499–535.

MSAH (Ministry of Social Affairs and Health). (2009). *The Proposal of the Working Group for a National Policy on Roma. Working group report.*

Helsinki: Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. [pdf] Available at: http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-00-2912-8 [Accessed: 23 June 2020].

MSAH (Ministry of Social Affairs and Health). (2018). *Finland's National Roma Policy (ROMPO) 2018-2022*. Helsinki: Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. [online] Available at: http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/160845/03_18_Suomen%20romanipoliittinen%20ohjelma_2018_2022_web.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y [Accessed: 23 June 2020]

Muižnieks, Nils. (2015). *Report by Nils Muižnieks commissioner for human rights of the council of europe following his visit to from to 23 january 2015*. [online] Availble at: https://rm.coe.int/ref/CommDH(2015)1 [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Mulinari, D., Keskinen, S., Irni, S. ja Tuori, S. (2009). Introduction: Postcolonialism and the Nordic models of welfare and gender. In S. Keskinen, Suvi, Tuori, Salla, Irni, Sari ja Mulinari, Diana., ed., *Complying with colonialism: Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 1–18.

Murji, Karim & Solomos, John. (2005). Introduction: Racialization in Theory and Practice. In Karim Murji & John Solomos, ed., *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–28.

Niemi, Anna-Maija, Mietola, Reetta & Helakorpi, Jenni. (2010). *Erityisluokka elämänkulussa. Selvitys peruskoulussa erityisluokalla opiskelleiden vammaisten, romaniväestöön kuuluvien ja maahanmuuttajataustaisten nuorten aikuisten koulutus- ja työelämäkokemuksista*. Helsinki: Finnish Ministry of the Interior.

Nimako, Kwame. (2012). About Them, But Without Them: Race and Ethnic Relations Studies in Dutch Universities. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 10(1), pp. 45–52.

Non-Discrimination Ombudsman (2014) *Erilaisena arjessa. Selvitys romanien syrjintäkokemuksista*. [online] Helsinki: Vähemmistövaltuutettu. Available at: https://www.syrjinta.fi/documents/10181/10850/52878_romaniselvitys_verkkoon+(1).pdf/584516fc-d3a7-4f88-8ecc-c8b2271ebf41 [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Nordberg, Camilla. (2015). Dynamics of recognition: Minority ethnic access to transformative power in the Nordic welfare state. In Kraus, P. A. and Kivisto, P., ed., *The challenge of minority integration,* De Gruyt Open, pp. 91–107.

Nordforsk. (2018). Education for tomorrow: How do we get there? Policy Implications from Phase 1. [online] Oslo: NordForsk. Available at:

http://www.justed.org/files/2018/06/Education-for-tomorrow-final-report.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

NOU [Norges offentlige utredninger]. (2015). *Assimilering og motstand Norsk politikk overfor taterne/romanifolket fra 1850 til i dag*. [online] Oslo: Departementenes sikkerhets- og serviceorganisasjon/Informasjonsforvaltning. Available at: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2015-7/id2414316/ [Accessed 23 June 2020].

Oakley, Ann. (1981). Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms. H. Roberts, ed., *Doing Feminist Research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 30 – 61.

Oakley, Ann. (2016). Interviewing Women Again: Power, Time and the Gift. *Sociology*, 50(1), pp. 195–213.

Odenbring , Ylva (2019): Strong boys and supergirls? School professionals' perceptions of students' mental health and gender in secondary school. *Education Inquiry*, doi: 10.1080/20004508.2018.1558665

OSCE [Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe]. (2003). *Action plan on improving the situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE area*. [online] Availble at : http://www.osce.org/odihr/17554?download=true [accessed 23 June 2020]

OECD [The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] (2018), Youth not in employment, education or training (NEET) (indicator). doi: 10.1787/72d1033a-en [Accessed on 22 March 2019]

Oinas, Elina. (2001). *Making sense of the teenage body: Sociological perspectives on girls, changing bodies and knowledge*. PhD. Åbo Akademi.

Oinas, Elina. (2004). Haastattelu: Kokemuksia, kohtaamisia, kerrontaa. In Marianne Liljeström, ed., *Feministinen tietäminen: Keskustelua metodologiasta*. Tampere: Vastapaino, pp. 208–228.

Osler, Audrey & Lybaek, Lena. (2014). Educating 'the new Norwegian we': an examination of national and cosmopolitan education policy discourses in the context of extremism and Islamophobia. *Oxford Review of Education*¸ 40(5), 543–566. DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2014.946896

Oslo kommune. (2012*). Romtiltaket rapport*. Oslo: Utdanningsetaten/ Voksenopplæring Skullerud

Palosuo, Laura. (2008). *En inventering av forkningen om romer i Sverige. Ett uppdrag från Delegationen för romska frågor*. [online] Uppsala universitet. Available at: http://arkiv.minoritet.se/romadelegationen/www.romadelegationen.se/dynamaster/file_archive/090208/97eaa0f908cc38ed96a63f922044979a/forskningsoversikt.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Parliament of Finland 1998, Perusopetuslaki. 21.8.1998/628 [Education Act]
Parliament of Sweden 2010, Skollag (2010:800) [Education Act]
Parliament of Norway 1998, Act of 17 July 1998 no. 61 relating to Primary and Secondary Education and Training [the Education Act]
Petersen, Eva Bendix. (2018). 'Data found us': A critique of some new materialist tropes in educational research. *Research in Education*, 101(1), pp. 5–16, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0034523718792161
Phoenix, Ann. (2009). Decolonising Practices: Negotiating Narratives from Racialised and Gendered Experiences of Education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 12(1), pp. 101–114. doi:10.1080/13613320802651053.
Picker, G. & Roccheggiani, G. (2013). Abnormalising minorities: The state and expert knowledge addressing the Roma in Italy. *Identities* 21(2), pp. 185–201. doi: 10.1080/1070289X.2013.854719
Popoviciu, Liviu, Haywood, Chris & Mac an Ghaill, Mairtin. (2006). The promise of post-structuralist methodology: ethnographic representation of education and masculinity. *Ethnography and Education*, 1(3), 393–412. DOI: 10.1080/17457820600836871.
Pulkkinen, Tuija. (2003). *Postmoderni politiikan filosofia*. Tampere: Gaudeamus.
Pulma, Panu (2006). *Suljetut ovet: Pohjoismaiden romanipolitiikka 1500-luvulta EU-aikaan*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
Rajala, Susanna & Blomerus, Satu. (2015). *Katsaus aikuisten romanien koulutustaustoihin*. [online] Helsinki: Opetushallitus. Available at: https://www.oph.fi/fi/tilastot-ja-julkaisut/julkaisut/katsaus-aikuisten-romanien-koulutustaustoihin [Accessed 23 June 2020]
Rajala, Susanna (2011) Kehittämistoiminnan taustaa. In Susanna Rajala, ed., *Romanioppilaiden perusopetuksen tuen hyviä käytäntöjä*. Helsinki: Finnish National Agency of Education, pp. 7–11.
Rajala, Susanna, Salonen, Minna, Blomerus, Satu & Nissilä, Leena. (2011). *Romanioppilaiden perusopetuksen tilannekatsaus 2010–2011*. [online] Helsinki: Opetushallitus. Available at: https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/140023_romanioppilaiden_perusopetuksen_tilannekatsaus_2010-2011_ja_toimenpide-ehdotukset.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]
Regjeringen.no. (2018) Ny stortingsmelding om nasjonale minoriteter i 2020 [Press Release] Available at: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/ny-stortingsmelding-om-nasjonale-minoriteter-i-2020/id2611584/ [Accessed: 23 June 2020]
Rekola, T. (2012). Romanien varhaisvaiheet Suomessa: 1600-luvulta 1800-luvun puoliväliin. In Panu Pulma, ed., Suomen romanien historia. 1st ed., Helsinki: Suomen Kirjallisuuden Seura, pp. 18–83.

Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, ed., *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 3rd edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 959-978

Rizvi, Fazal & Lingard, Bob (2009). *Globalizing Education Policy*. London & New York: Routledge.

RMERCA [The Royal Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs]. (n.d.) *Core Curriculum for Primary, Secondary and Adult Education in Norway*. [online] Availble at: https://www.udir.no/globalassets/filer/lareplan/generell-del/core_curriculum_english.pdf [accessed 23 June 2020]

Rodell Olgaç, Christina. (2007). *Den romska minoriteten i majoritetssamhällets skola. Från hot till möjlighet.* PhD. Lärarhögskolan i Stockholm.

Rodell Olgaç, Christina. (2013). 'Education of Roma in Sweden: An interplay between policy and practice'. In Horneberg, S., and Brüggemann, C, ed., 1st ed., *Die Bildungssituation von Roma in Europa*. 1st ed, Münster: Waxmann Verlag, pp. 197–213.

Rodell Olgaç, Christina & Dimiter-Taikon, Angelina. (2016). *Romsk brobyggarutbildning med inriktning mot skolan 2012-2015: Högre utbildning, social mobilitet och interkulturellt kapital*. Södertörns högskola.

Roll-Hansen, Nils. 2005. Norwegian Eugenics: Sterilization as Social Reform. In Gunnar Broberg & Nils Roll-Hansen (ed.) *Eugenics and the Welfare State : Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland*, 2nd ed., East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, pp. 151–194.

Romanit.fi. (n.d.) *Romanit.fi sivusto tarjoaa tietoa*. [online] Available at: www.romanit.fi [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Rorke, Bernard. (2014). *Roma integration and 'a normal way of living'*. [blog] openDemocracy: free thinking for the world. Available at: https://www.opendemocracy.net/can-europe-make-it/bernard-rorke/roma-integration-and-normal-way-of-living [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Rosvoll, Maria & Bielenberg, Natasha. (2012). *Antisiganisme, stereotypier og diskriminering av rom*. [online] Oslo: HL-senteret. Available at: https://www.hlsenteret.no/aktuelt/publikasjoner/digitale-hefter/pdf/hl_temahefte_14_digital.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Rosvoll, Maria, Lien, Lars, & Brustad, Jan Alexander (2015). *'Å bli dem kvit': Utviklingen av en 'sigøynerpolitikk' og utryddelsen av norske rom*. [online] Oslo: HL-senteret. Avaible at: https://www.hlsenteret.no/aktuelt/2015/a-bli-dem-kvit%281%29.html [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Runcis, M. 2016. Historikern, experterna och steriliseringarna av resanderomer. I: Sandén, A. & Elgán, E. (red.) Kunskapens tider: Historiska perspektiv på kunskapssamhället. Pp. 110–127. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.16993/bai.h. License: CC-BY 4.0

Rus, C., & Zatreanu, M. 2009. Guide for Roma School Mediators/Assistants. Strasbourg: Council of Europe – Directorate General IV. Available at: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/roma/Source/Guide_EN.PDF. [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Ruusuvuori Johanna & Tiittula Liisa. (2005). Tutkimushaastattelu ja vuorovaikutus. In Johanna Ruusuvuori & Liisa Tiittula, ed., *Haastattelu: Tutkimus, tilanteet ja vuorovaikutus*. Vastapaino, Tampere, pp. 22–56.

RUF [Romska Ungdomsförbundet] (2013). *Vi laser om romer: av och om romer i Sverige*. Malmö: Romska Ungdomsförbundet

Rövid, Marton. (2011). One size fits all? "One-Size-Fits-All-Roma"? On the Normative Dilemmas of the Emerging European Roma Policy. *Romani Studies*. 21(1), 1–22, doi: 10.3828/rs.2011.1

Sager, Alex. 2014. Methodological Nationalism, Migration and Political Theory. *Political Studies* 64(1), pp. 42–59. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9248.12167.

Said, Edward. (2011). *Orientalismi*. Translation: Kati Pitkänen. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Sassen, Saskia. (2010). The global inside the national: A research agenda for sociology. *Sociopedia.isa*, pp. 1–10.

Sayan, Pinar. (2018). Enforcement of the anti-Racism legislation of the European Union against antigypsyism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2018.1468568

Scott, Joan W. (1988). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: Or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism. *Feminist Studies*, 14 (1), pp. 33–50.

Selling, Jan. (2014). *Svensk antiziganism: Fördomens kontinuitet och förändringaensförutsättningar* Riga: Östkultur Förslag.

Sjögren, D. (2010). *Den säkra zonen: Motiv, åtgärdsförslag och verksamhet i den särskiljande utbildningspolitiken för inhemska minoriteter 1913-1962*. PhD. Umeå universitet.

Skr. 2011. *Regeringens skrivelse 2011/12:56 En samordnad och långsiktig strategi för romsk inkludering 2012–2032*. Available at: https://www.regeringen.se/49bafe/contentassets/4a3df6c115584782935d8d9efa7ab6e3/en-samordnad-och-langsiktig-strategi-for-romsk-inkludering-2012-2032-skr.-20111256 [Accessed: 23 June 2020]

Skr. 2011. *Government communication 2011/12:56 A coordinated long-term strategy for Roma inclusion 2012–2032*. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/roma_sweden_strategy_en_0.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

SNAE [Swedish National Agency for Education]. (2007). *Romer i skolan – en fördjupad studie*. [online] Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Education. Available at: http://www.minoritet.se/4381 [Accessed 23 June 2020]

SNAE [Swedish National Agency for Education]. (2011). Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet 2011 (Reviderad 2016). [online] Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Education. Available at: https://www.skolverket.se/publikationsserier/styrdokument/2016/laroplan-for-grundskolan-forskoleklassen-och-fritidshemmet-2011-reviderad-2016?id=2575 [Accessed 23 June 2020]

SNAE [Swedish National Agency for Education]. (2018). Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and school-age educare REVISED 2018 Available at: https://www.skolverket.se/publikationsserier/styrdokument/2018/curriculum-for-the-compulsory-school-preschool-class-and-school-age-educare-revised-2018?id=3984 [Accessed 23 June 2020]

SNAE [Swedish National Agency for Education] (2019). *Redovisning av regeringsuppdrag Att ta fram och tillgängliggöra en utbildning för brobyggare med romsk språk- och kulturkompetens* [online] Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Education. Available at: https://www.skolverket.se/download/18.6bfaca41169863e6a65d0e9/1553967807200/pdf3908.pdf [Accessed 23 April 2019]

SNAE: Stödpaket. (f.d.) Stödpaket för att undervisa om romer [website] Available at: https://www.skolverket.se/skolutveckling/inspiration-och-stod-i-arbetet/stod-i-arbetet/kampanj-stodpaket-undervisa-om-romer [Accessed 23 June 2020]

SOU [Statens offentliga utredningar] (2000) Steriliseringsfrågan i Sverige 1935 - 1975 Historisk belysning - Kartläggning – Intervjuer [online] Available at: http://www.regeringen.se/49b6c6/contentassets/68b217b7f8e746a799536f3ad851c05e/steriliseringsfragan-i-sverige-1935---1975 [Accessed 23 June 2020].

SOU [Statens offentliga utredningar] (2010). *Romers rätt – en strategi för romer i Sverige*. [online] Stockholm. Available at: http://www.regeringen.se/rattsdokument/statens-offentliga-utredningar/2010/07/sou-201055/ [Accessed 23 June 2020].

SOU [Statens offentliga utredningar]. (2016). *Kraftsamling mot antiziganism: Slutbetänkande av Kommissionen mot antiziganism.* [online] Stockholm. Available at: https://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/b76e2b51299b42eba2c360c58f0754f7/kraftsamling-mot-antiziganism-sou-201644 [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Spivak, Gayatry Chakravorty. (1974). Preface. In Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translation by Spivak, Gayatry Chakravorty. London: John Hopkins University Press.

Steinmetzt, George. (2005). Introduction. Positivism and Its Others in the Social Sciences. In George Steinmetz, ed., *The politics of method in the human sciences: Positivism and its epistemological others*. Durham/London: Duke university press, pp. 1–57.

Steinmetz, George (ed.). (2005). *The politics of method in the human sciences: positivism and its epistemological others.* Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Stenroos, Marko. (2019). Power and Hierarchy among Finnish Kaale Roma. Critical Romani Studies, 1(2), 6–23. https://dx.doi.org/10.29098/crs.v1i2.12

St. Meld (2000). *St.meld.nr. 15 (2000–2001) Nasjonale minoritetar I Noreg – Om statleg politikk overfor jødar, kvener, rom, romanifolket og skogfinnar. Tilråding frå Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet av 8. desember 2000, godkjend i statsråd same dagen.* Det Kongelege kommunal- og regionaldepartement. Available at: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-15-2000-2001-/id585195/ [Accessed 23 June 2020]

St. Pierre, Elisabeth Adams. (2000). Poststructural Feminism in Education: An Overview. *Qualitative Studies in Education* 5 (13), pp. 477–515.

St. Pierre, Elisabeth Adams & Pillow, Wanda. (2000). Introduction: Inquiry among the Ruins. IN: Elisabeth Adams St. Pierre & Wanda Pillow, ed., *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education*. 1st ed. New York: Routledge, 1–26.

St. Pierre Elisabeth Adams. (2014) A Brief and Personal History of Qualitative Research. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 30(2), 2–19

Surdu, Mihai. (2016). *Those Who Count: Expert Practices of Roma Classification*. Budapest – New York: Central European University Press.

SVT Nyheter (2017). Utbildning för romska barn får ny kritik – riskerar miljonvite. [online] Available at: https://www.svt.se/nyheter/lokalt/stockholm/skola-for-romska-barn-far-ny-kritik-stockholms-stad-riskerar-miljonvite [Accessed 23 June 2020].

SVT Nyheter (2016). Romsk profilklass läggs ner efter 20 år. Available at: https://www.svt.se/nyheter/lokalt/stockholm/romsk-profilklass-laggs-ner [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Syrjä, Hannele & Valtakari, Mikko. (2008). *Romanien pitkä matka työn markkinoille: Tutkimus romanien työmarkkinoille sijoittumisen edistämisestä*. Helsinki: Työ- ja elinkeinoministeriön julkaisuja.

TENK [Finnish National Board on Research Integrity]. (2009). Humanistisen, yhteiskuntatieteellisen ja käyttäytymistieteellisen tutkimuksen eettiset periaatteet ja ehdotus eettisen ennakkoarvioinnin järjestämiseksi. [online] Available at: https://www.tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/eettisetperiaatteet.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Tervonen, Miika. (2012a). *'Gypsies', 'Travellers' and 'peasants': A study on ethnic boundary drawing in Finland and Sweden, c. 1860–1925*. PhD. European University Institute.

Tervonen, Miika. (2012b). Romanit ja suuri muutos. In Panu Pulma, ed., *Suomen romanien historia*. 1st ed., Helsinki: Suomen Kirjallisuuden Seura, pp. 166–197.

Tervonen, Miika. (2014). Historiankirjoitus ja myytti yhden kulttuurin Suomesta. In P. Markkola, H. Snellman & A-C Östman, ed., *Kotiseutu ja kansakunta: Miten suomalaista historiaa on rakennettu*. 1st ed. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 137–162.

Toivanen, Reetta. (2015). From Ignorance to Effective Inclusion: The Role of National Minorities within the Finnish Consensus Culture. In Peter A. Kraus, Peter Kivisto, ed., *The Challenge of Minority Integration: Politics and Policies in the Nordic Nations*. Berlin: DeGruyter, pp. 110 – 140.

Tolonen, Tarja. (2012). Classed and gendered meanings of marginalization in young people's transitions. In Tolonen, T. Palmu, T., Lappalainen, S. & Kurki, T., ed., *Cultural practices and transitions in education*. 1st ed. London: Tufnell Press, pp. 126–138.

Tuori, Salla. (2009). *The politics of multicultural encounters: Feminist postcolonial perspectives.* PhD-thesis. Åbo Akademi.

Tydén, Mattias & Broberg, Gunnar. (2005). Eugenics in Sweden: Efficient Care. In Gunnar Broberg & Nils Roll-Hansen, ed., *Eugenics and the Welfare State : Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland*, 2nd ed., East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, pp. 77–149.

Tyldum, G., & Friberg, J. H. (2014). *Et skritt på veien: Evaluering av handlingsplan for å bedre levekårene blant rom i Oslo*. [online] Oslo: Fafo. Available at: http://www.fafo.no/index.php/zoo-publikasjoner/fafo-rapporter/item/et-skritt-pa-veien [Accessed: 23 June 2020]

udir.no. (n.d.) *Fagfornyelsen* [website] Available at: https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/fagfornyelsen/ [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, (resolution 217 A), adopted 10 December 1948

United Nations. (2010). Minority Rights: International Standards and Guidance for Implementation. Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/MinorityRights_en.pdf [accessed 23 June 2020]

United Nations. (2013). The role of United Nations in advancing Roma inclusion. [online] Available at: https://europe.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/RomaInclusion.pdf [accessed: 20 April 2019]

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2014). Våre nasjonale minoriteter. Til ansatte i barnehage og skoler. [online] Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet. Available at: https://www.udir.no/globalassets/filer/laringsmiljo/nasjonale-minoriteter/nasjonale_minoriteter_udir.pdf [Accessed 23 June 2020]

Vajda, Violeta. (2015). Towards 'Critical Whiteness' in Romani Studies. *Roma Rights Journal Of The European Roma Rights Centre*, 2, pp. 47–56.

Valluvan, Sivamohan. (2016). What is 'post-race' and what does it reveal about contemporary racisms?, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(13), pp. 2241-2251. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2016.1202430.

van Baar, Huub. (2011). Europe's Romaphobia: Problematization, securitization, nomadization. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29(2), pp. 203–212, DOI: 10.1068/d2902ed1

van Baar, Huub (2012a) Toward a politics of representation beyond hegemonic neoliberalism: the European Romani movement revisited. *Citizenship Studies*, 16(2), pp. 287-296. DOI: 10.1080/13621025.2012.667620

van Baar, Huub. (2012b). Socio-economic mobility and neo-liberal governmentality in post-socialist Europe: Activation and dehumanisation of the Roma. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 38(8), 1289 – 1304.

van Baar, Huub. (2016). Evictability and the Biopolitical Bordering of Europe. *Antipode*, 49(1), pp. 212–230. doi: 10.1111/anti.12260.

Vermeersch, Peter. (2012). Reframing the Roma: EU Initiatives and the Politics of Reinterpretation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(8), pp. 1195-1212. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2012.689175

Vermeersch, Peter. (2006) *The Romani movement: Minority politics and ethnic mobilization in contemporary central Europe*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

Viljanen-Saira, Anna Maria. (1986). Mustalaistutkimus – tietoa vai tunteita. In Tenho Aaltonen, Kirsti Laurinolli, Lasse Lyytikäinen & Kaarina

Nazarenko, *Kultaiset korvarenkaat. Mustalaisten kulttuuri ja käsityöt*. Helsinki: Otava, pp. 22–39.

Vuolajärvi, Niina. (2014). Rotu etnisten suhteiden tutkimuksessa. In S. Irni, M. Meskus & V. Oikkonen, ed., *Muokattu elämä: Teknotiede, sukupuoli ja materiaalisuus*. Tampere: Vastapaino, pp. 264–301.

Weedon, Chris. (1987). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Weedon, Chris (2004). *Identity and Culture*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Weimer, David & Vining, Aidan R. (2014). *Policy analysis: Concepts and Practice*. Edinburgh: Pearson education Limited.

Wekker, Gloria. (2017). *White Innocence: Pradoxes of Colonialism and Race*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Wiklander, L. (2015). Resandefolket och svensk minoritetspolitik: 1990-talets paradigmskifte. *Historisk tidskrift (Sweden)*, 135(4), pp. 622–648.

Williams, James. (2014). *Understanding Poststructuralism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wimmer, Andreas and Glick Schiller Nina. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks* 2(4), pp. 301–334.

World Bank & European Commission. (2015). *Handbook for improving the living conditions of Roma at the local level*. [online] Available at: http://coe-romact.org/sites/default/files/romact_resources_files/worldbank_handbook_roma_en.pdf [accessed 23 June 2020]

Yıldız, Can & De Genova, Nicholas (2018) Un/Free mobility: Roma migrants in the European Union. *Social Identities*, 24(4), pp. 425-441. DOI: 10.1080/13504630.2017.1335819

YLE uutiset (2018a). Poliisi tutkii tivolin työntekijän romaniperhettä loukannutta käytöstä – laitteessa soitettiin rasistista pilkkalaulua. [online] Available at: https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-10263950 [Accessed 23 June. 2020].

YLE uutiset. (2018b). Romaniperheen ei annettu tankata käteisellä huoltoasemalla – tilanne tallentui videolle: "Vieläkin ihmisillä on näin kovat ja pinttyneet ennakkoluulot." Yle Uutiset. [online] Available at: https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-10203736 [Accessed 23 June. 2020].

Youdell, Deborah. (2006a). Subjectivation and Performative Politics – Butler Thinking Althusser and Foucault: Intelligibility, Agency and the Raced–Nationed–Religioned Subjects of Education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 27(4), pp. 511–528.

Youdell, Deborah. (2006b). *Impossible Bodies, Impossible Selves: Exclusions and Student Subjectivities*. The Netherlands: Springer.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. (1997). *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage Publications.
Yuval-Davis, Nira. (2011). *The politics of belonging*. *Intersectional contestations*. London: Sage.
Yuval-Davis, N., Wemyss, G., & Cassidy, K. (2017). Introduction to the special issue: Racialized bordering discourses on European Roma. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(7), pp. 1047–1057. doi:10.1080/01419870.2017.1267382
Yuval-Davis, N., Varjú, V., Tervonen, M., Hakim, J., & Fathi, M. (2017). Press discourses on Roma in the UK, Finland and Hungary. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(7), pp. 1151–1169. doi:10.1080/01419870.2017.1267379

Appendix 1. Research contract

Research agreement

I participate to Jenni Helakorpi's research. I agree to usage of the data with the following terms:

The data is solely used for research and education purposes. The real names of the participants of the research are not used. All the information that could make the participants recognizable are changed (e.g. the names of municipalities and the schools). Helakorpi may use the data also in her future research. Helakorpi makes sure of the anonymity of the participants and files the data it safely.

Date and place

Participant

Jenni Helakorpi

Jenni Helakorpi
p: +358XX XXXX XXX/ +358XX XXXX XXX
jenni.helakorpi@helsinki.fi

Appendix 2. General outline for interview themes

For Finnish Roma mediators (teaching assistants)

- Education and work background
- Teaching assistant work and education
- Job description and everyday as a teaching assistant
- Work community, pupils and parents
- Work satisfaction and developing the work
- Significance of Roma background and meanings given to it
- School attendance of pupils with Roma background
- Views about how schools should be developed
- Views concerning needs for future research and policy making

For Swedish and Norwegian research participants

- Implementation of Roma policy at the locality
- The situation of Roma and Travellers at the locality
- The situation in basic education of Roma and Travellers at the locality
- Promotion of basic education at the locality
- The work of Roma mediators
- The Roma and Traveller politics and policies in Sweden/Norway
- Interviewees own experiences from education and work
- Views concerning needs for future research and policy making

Helsinki Studies in Education

ISSN 1798-8322 (print)
ISSN 2489-2297 (online)
ISBN 978-951-51-6260-1 (paperback)
ISBN 978-951-51-6261-8 (PDF)
http://ethesis.helsinki.fi
Unigrafia
Helsinki 2020

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES